DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, M.A., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. P. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Hon. Treasurer.* L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.
With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;
Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;
Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXVII AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1923 Nos. 5, 6

CONTENTS

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Double Numbers, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. $3.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. $6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (*a*) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (*b*) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (*c*) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (*d*) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. H. A. Ormerod, 46, Cliff Road, Hyde Park, Leeds; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford, and Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, St. John's College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. E. W. V. Clifton, 26, Danesbury Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Miss F. M. Rees, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss P. K. Downes, Redland High School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss C. E. Parker, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. M. Watson, Central Girls' School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. J. Whatmough, University College, Bangor; Miss Buckley, Simon Langton School for Girls, Canterbury; Miss D. J. L. Poole, 19, Banbury Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 6, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. A. B. Jeffries, 100, Cedar Road, Southampton; and Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter.

The Classical Review

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1923

TWO TRANSLATIONS

'LET US EAT AND DRINK . . .'

If I drink water while this doth last,
May I never again drink wine:
For how can a man, in his life of a span,
Do anything better than dine?
We'll dine and drink, and say if we think
That anything better can be;
And when we have dined, wish all mankind
May dine as well as we.

T. L. Peacock.

Quis Baccho potior deus?
Dum cadi mihi suppetunt,
Exul his aqua sit labris:
Sin minus, mala Tantali
Viuum me sitis urat.
Vitae summa iubet fugax
Indulgere mero et cibis;
Adque mala ubi uentum erit,
Tum precabimur omnibus
Tam bene esse epulari.

E. H.

'LET'S TALK OF WORMS . . .'

When we behold a wide, turf-covered expanse, we should remember that its smoothness, on which so much of its beauty depends, is mainly due to all the inequalities having been slowly levelled by earth-worms. It is a marvellous reflection that the whole of the superficial mould over any such expanse has passed, and will again pass every few years, through the bodies of worms. The plough is one of the most ancient and valuable of man's inventions; but long before he existed the land was in fact regularly ploughed, and still continues to be thus ploughed, by earth-worms. It may be doubted whether there are many other animals which have played so important a part in the history of the world as have these lowly organised creatures.—Darwin.

Praeterea late florentis gramine campos
cum uideas, nimirum oculis uenit inde uoluptas
praesertim quia plana patent campi aequora circum:
plana autem factast, quae quondam erat aspera, tellus
uermiculorum opera qui in terris inueniuntur.
hi loca camporum pedetemptim leuia reddunt;
nam quae uestit humus molli quasi cortice campum,
transiit haec omnis per corpora uermiculorum
transibitque iterum paucis uoluentibus annis.
rem tu, si reputes, merito mirabere tantam.
sunt antiqua hominum, sunt et praeclara reperta,
praecipuasque meret laudes inuentor aratri;
ante tamen genitos homines, ut tempus ad hoc fit,
uermes usque suo uertebant uomere glaebas.
huic igitur summae uix ulla animalia tantum
contulerunt, quantum tam paucis sensibus aucti
uermiculi.

J. D. D.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

To teachers of English and of Latin, as well as to those who engage in propaganda for or against either subject as an educational instrument, we recommend a careful perusal of a lecture delivered in February by Dr. J. W. Mackail to the Leeds and District Branch of the Classical Association, now published as *The Alliance of Latin and English Studies* (London, John Murray, 1s. net). 'In an age of increasing specialisation, at a time given over to the pursuit of short-cuts and the invention of substitutes, when the weight of accumulated knowledge, already greater than can be borne, is multiplying almost daily, can we recover that grasp of the unity of learning which is at once the symbol and the substantiation of a sense of the unity of life? If so, it is clear that the first thing to be done is to discard bodily the idea of competition in studies, and replace it by the idea of their co-operation and mutual reinforcement.' Leaving to those engaged in teaching and organisation the consideration of means and methods, Dr. Mackail pleads with his usual grace and power for the correlation of English and Latin studies in the interest of both subjects and of humane education.

J. T. S. writes:

The Oxford *Rhesus* was delightful, partly because of the charming setting in the garden of New College, with barbaric tents for the Trojan encampment and noble medieval ruins for the walls of Troy. At night the shadows and the impending darkness may have added a touch of mystery, a suggestion of real war and tragedy. In the afternoon the sunshine, the green glades, and the trees, together with the not unpleasing but distracting music of the Oxford bells, kept one happily aware that all was make-believe. These gracious people, who talked and sang of war and night-adventure, danger and cunning, loyalty and death, were happy children of the fancy, not real men, sweating for destiny. That would have been a pity if the play had been *Medea* or *Hippolytus*; for the *Rhesus* it seemed right. The play has interest and beauty, but no tragic tension. Even pathos is hardly felt until the lamentation of the Muse at the end turns fantasy into high poetry. The skill of Mr. Cyril Bailey and his actors, helped by the setting and the music, contrived to give the whole play, not the last scene only, poetic value. Hector's gallant bearing—perhaps a shade more gallant than the text suggests—the languid grace of Rhesus—more modest, perhaps, than the author intended—and Athena's pleasant combination of majesty and mischief, remain in the memory. For the sake of the total impression we should have liked a touch of poetry in Dolon, though his comedy was in itself excellent; and we think Odysseus and Diomede might have been given harder outlines, more sharply contrasted with the Trojan chivalry and vagueness. But nearly all the details seemed to us right, and the producer had his reward in the complete success of the final scene, superbly sung and acted by the Muse. Had the earlier scenes been presented as crude melodrama the end might have seemed a purple patch, and the whole incoherent. As it was, the performance gave us a new and, we think, true interpretation of the spirit of a very graceful poem.

A notice of the performance of the *Birds* at King's College, Strand, will appear in our next issue.

THE REVERSE OF ARISTOTLE.

'*Peripeteia:* a sudden change of fortune or reverse of circumstances.'—*New Eng. Dict.*

THE word *peripeteia* has done long and strenuous service. Critics from the Renaissance to Mr. Walkley, historians from Polybius to Mr. John Buchan, have never wearied of the golden term—everything, in fact, is known about it, except perhaps its meaning, or, rather, its meanings; for its uses, by Aristotle in dramatic criticism, and by later writers as a general term, are, I think, quite different and distinct. The traditional rendering, 'a reversal of fortune' or 'tragic catastrophe,' fits Polybius and other post-Aristotelian authors; but it has made nonsense for centuries in the *Poetics*.

This is, of course, no new theory. Over half a century ago it was suggested by Vahlen, who had himself been anticipated to some extent by Pye in 1792. Yet in England, at all events, this view has strangely failed to take hold. Butcher faces both ways, and Bywater will have none of it. Some of the arguments that follow are, I find, not new, but a good deal of the evidence

seems to me to have been neglected; and since the last word has been spoken on the other side by the standard English editor of the *Poetics*, Bywater, a restatement of the reasons in favour of Vahlen's view need not, I hope, seem a mere championing of the obvious.

There are six main passages in the *Poetics* where the *peripeteia* is mentioned:

(1) The first and most important is 1452a, 22-3, *ἔστι δὲ περιπέτεια μὲν ἡ εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν πραττομένων μεταβολή*. Of which the *traditional* rendering is: 'Reversal of the situation is a change of the action to its opposite.'

'It must occur,' Aristotle adds, 'in accordance with our rule of the probable or inevitable. Thus in the *Oedipus* the messenger comes to cheer Oedipus and set his mind at rest about his mother, but by revealing who he is produces the opposite effect. Similarly in the *Lynceus* the hero is led away to execution, and Danaus follows, meaning to kill him, but, as the result of previous action, it comes about that Danaus gets killed himself, while Lynceus is saved.'

(2) In 1452a, 12-18, Aristotle classifies plots as (1) simple, (2) complex. Complex plots are those which contain a *peripeteia* or an *anagnorisis*, or both.

(3) In 1450a, 33-5, peripeties and discoveries (*ἀναγνωρίσεις*) are described as the most moving things in tragedy.

(4) In 1456a, 19-23, Agathon is praised for his adroit peripeties, in which a clever rogue like Sisyphus is outwitted or a brave villain foiled [*cf.* (1) above; and think of Shylock or Macbeth].

(5) In 1454b, 29-30, the *anagnorisis* of Odysseus by his nurse is described as *ἐκ περιπετείας* ('by a turn of incident,' Butcher; but see below).

(6) In 1459b, 14, the *Iliad* is classed as 'simple'—that is, without a *peripeteia*—whereas it abounds in reversals of fortune.

The next thing is to give a brief history of the controversy.

In 1792 Pye gave the rendering: 'A sudden and violent reversal of fortune, brought about by means apparently likely to produce the opposite effect.' This is absolutely right, except that Aristotle says nothing of suddenness or violence, which are indeed not essential, though usual.

In 1866 Vahlen (*Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserl. Akad. in Wien.* LII., p. 89 ff.; or *Beiträge* II., pp. 6 and 68) urged similarly that a *peripeteia* is any event where the agent's intention is overruled to produce an effect the exact opposite of his intention. It is not itself a 'reversal of the situation,' only the means by which one is produced. *τῶν πραττομένων* could not mean 'of the *situation*,' for it must denote a course of action, not a state of affairs.

Susemihl in his edition of the *Poetics* (1874) followed Vahlen.

In 1895 Dr. Lock, of Keble, Oxford, upheld the same view in a very lucid article in the *Classical Review* (IX., pp. 251-3). His main points may be summed up as follows:

(1) *περιπέτεια*, *ἀναγνώρισις*, and *πάθος* are, says Aristotle, the three means through which the change of fortune is brought about (1452a, 13-7; 1452b, 9-13). Therefore *περιπέτεια* cannot itself mean 'change of fortune.' (It is the explosive, not the explosion.)

This argument is sound enough, though wrongly stated. Aristotle says that these three are constituents of the plot, not that the *πάθος* is a means to the change of fortune (as the *περιπέτεια* and *ἀναγνώρισις* are); and clearly a 'scene of suffering,' such as the last scene of the *Oedipus*, is result, not cause, of the catastrophe. Leave out all reference to *πάθος*, and for the *περιπέτεια* the reasoning stands.

(2) Aristotle's example of the messenger in the *Oedipus* is all-sufficing. He tries to dispel the hero's fears; in the very act he proves them but too true. Dr. Lock compares the use of the term *περιπέτεια* by the Venetian scholiast on *Il.* II. 155. Agamemnon tries to improve the morale of his army by a trick; in effect, he ruins it so completely that only a goddess out of a machine can retrieve the situation. That the scholiast rightly calls a *peripeteia*.

(3) In 1452a, 32-3, Aristotle says, *καλλίστη δὲ ἀναγνώρισις ὅταν ἅμα περιπέτειαι γίνωνται*, as in the *Oedipus*. Dr. Lock argues from the plural *περιπέτειαι* that the word cannot mean 'change of

situation,' for of these there is only one in the play. Aristotle is referring, he thinks, to the two peripeties in Vahlen's sense which are to be found in the *Oedipus*.

But the plural is surely merely a generalising one. It is the reader's natural impulse to take it so, and of the above arguments (2) is by far the strongest. In his third edition of 1902 Butcher professed himself convinced, and rendered *περιπέτεια* 'reversal of intention.'

But in the same year Bywater delivered a counter-attack in the *Festschrift Theodor Gomperz* (p. 168 ff.).

He begins with the Lynceus-Danaus example. First, he says, you have Lynceus as doomed prisoner, Danaus as executioner; then Lynceus saved, Danaus dead. The situation *has* been reversed.

This example is, in fact, indecisive by itself, for it is, at least, equally favourable to Vahlen's view: Danaus' action has had the very opposite result to his intention, for the biter is bit, the would-be slayer slain.

The *Oedipus* instance Bywater finds harder to explain. Let me quote it more fully: *ἔστι δὲ περιπέτεια μὲν ἡ εἰς ἐναντίον τῶν πραττομένων μεταβολή, καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ὥσπερ λέγομεν κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ ἀναγκαῖον, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ Οἰδίποδι ἐλθὼν ὡς εὐφρανῶν τὸν Οἰδίπουν καὶ ἀπαλλάξων τοῦ πρὸς τὴν μητέρα φόβου, δηλώσας ὃς ἦν, τοὐναντίον ἐποίησεν.*

Bywater's argument is that the messenger is not meant to illustrate *περιπέτεια* at all, but only the phrase *κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ ἀναγκαῖον*. One must always provide a proper chain of causation—*e.g.* in the *Oedipus* the messenger is an essential link in the chain.

This is surely very far-fetched. Such a view makes the emphatic *τοὐναντίον* irrelevant and misleading; and it treats the twin examples from the *Oedipus* and the *Lynceus* as illustrating two absolutely different things—the first as an instance of proper causation, and the second of the *peripeteia* itself.

Finally, Bywater complains that Vahlen's rendering of the word is 'more artificial than a stage-term can bear.' If the technical terminology of an art may not be artificial, what may? And what does 'artificial' mean in this context? If Bywater's contention is that reversals of intention are rare and exceptional things, that, as we shall see, is merely untrue.

Butcher, however, was reconverted 'in the main': 'reversal of intention,' says his edition of 1911, 'may enter into the *peripeteia*, but it is not an essential.'

Meanwhile Bywater's edition of 1909 had added nothing except the entirely pointless observation (which makes one doubt if he ever really understood his opponents) that on Vahlen's theory the *peripeteia* of the *Oedipus* would be 'a fact in the life of the messenger, not the turning-point in that of Oedipus.' It is, on any theory, both of these. The intention that is overruled and reversed, as Vahlen expressly said, *need not* be the hero's, though it usually is. For instance, in the story of Tristram and Yseult, where the very philtre that was to knit Yseult to her husband, King Mark, is the cause of her unfaithfulness, the fatal agents are likewise minor characters—Yseult's mother and Brangwain.

Such are the main arguments as yet advanced. Something remains to be said from the linguistic point of view in justification of Vahlen's rendering; and there is a good deal to be done in correlating the rival interpretations with Aristotle's tragic theory elsewhere in the *Poetics* and with the practice of tragedy in general.

First, then, what evidence is there that *περιπέτεια* could bear the special technical sense which Aristotle seems to give it—'the reversal of an agent's intention'; 'a hoist with one's own petard'; 'the issue of action, aimed at a result *x*, in the opposite of *x*'?

In authors after Aristotle, such as Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch, *περιπέτεια* unquestionably means simply 'a vicissitude of fortune,' generally in a bad sense. In authors before Aristotle it does not seem to occur at all. Aristotle himself also uses the word in his *Rhetoric* (I. 11)—a passage inconclusive for our purpose—and in his *History of Animals* (590b, 13), where he relates how the polyp eats the crab, the crab the conger, and the conger

the polyp. This eccentricity Aristotle describes as a *περιπέτεια*; and Bywater and Butcher take this to support their view, the latter translating 'a turn of incident.'

Even if this were right, Aristotle's use of the word here in its later, wider sense would not disprove its special meaning as a term of dramatic criticism in the *Poetics*. But there is a better answer. Surely here, too, we have the hoist with one's own petard, the return of the boomerang—the eater is eaten by its food's food. Change the *dramatis personae* to man, chicken, worm, and you get a touch of life's *macabre* irony, over which Webster might have chuckled and James Thomson actually does. The eater is eaten by what was meat for his meat.

The adjective *περιπετής*, in the literal sense of falling on or round or foul of something, is as old as Aeschylus. Of its metaphorical use these two early instances (all that I can find) are relevant here. In Eur. *Andr.* 983-4 Orestes says to Hermione:

> *νῦν οὖν ἐπειδὴ περιπετεῖς ἔχεις τύχας*
> *καὶ ξυμφορὰν τήνδ' ἐσπεσοῦσ' ἀμηχανεῖς,*
> *ἄξω σ' ἀπ' οἴκων.*

'Now, since your fortunes are reversed, and in your present plight you do not know what to do, I will take you away'—so the traditionalists would render, making *ξυμφορὰν τήνδ' ἐσπεσοῦσ'* a merely tautologous repetition of *περιπετεῖς ἔχεις τύχας*. Surely it is at least as possible that *περιπετεῖς* had at this date not yet been worn down in circulation to the later indistinctness of the noun, and means here not merely 'reversed,' but 'recoiling on your own head.' Hermione is the biter bit. She has tried to supplant her rival, and brought that danger on herself. As her nurse has just said (810): 'She is afraid lest, having sought to slay those she should not, she be slain herself.' The *peripeteia* in Vahlen's sense is perfect.

So with the other passage, Hdt. VIII. 20. The Euboeans had an oracle of Bakis warning them to remove their herds from their island into safety, 'when the barbarian should cast a yoke of papyrus on to the sea'—a clear allusion to the bridge over the Hellespont. The Euboeans, however, ignored this warning, with the result that they lost their cattle and *περιπετέα ἐποιήσαντο σφίσι αὐτοῖσι τὰ πρήγματα*. 'Brought a reversal of fortune on themselves' is the usual rendering; but here, as in Euripides, the subtler meaning seems possible. The Euboeans had a perfectly good oracle, which ought to have saved them, but their stupidity brought about the opposite result. If one could suppose that the Euboeans thought the casting of such a yoke so wildly improbable that instead of being forewarned they were lulled into a false security, it would be one more example of a favourite form of *peripeteia*, best seen perhaps in *Macbeth*. There the usurper is repeatedly fooled by ambiguous prophecies into a confidence that but ensures his ruin; none of woman born shall slay him, and so he rushes into the fight and dies on the sword of Macduff. Herodotus, however, it must be owned, says that the Euboeans 'neglected,' not that they misinterpreted, the oracle; and for true ancient parallels one must look to Croesus crossing the Halys 'to destroy a mighty empire,' or Pyrrhus of Epirus, like Oedipus, misled by a prophecy he was meant to misunderstand.

The evidence of these two examples of *περιπετής* is then inconclusive, though certainly not adverse. The verb *περιπίπτω* is far commoner, but always in the sense, whether literal or metaphorical, of 'falling in' or 'in with' or 'foul of,' rather than of 'falling round to the contrary.' I used to think that the use of *περιπέτεια*, to denote the defeat of an agent's intention by his own action, might be connected with the very frequent reflexive use of *περιπίπτω*, 'to trip oneself up by one's own undoing.'

Cf. Hdt. I. 108, where Astyages says to Harpagus: 'Do what I tell you and don't try to deceive me'—*μηδέ . . . ἄλλους ἑλόμενος ἐξ ὑστέρης σεωυτῷ περιπέσῃς* (bring destruction on your own head).

Thuc. II. 65, *αὐτοὶ ἐν σφίσι περιπεσόντες ἐσφάλησαν*.

Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* 26, 2, *ὅρα μὴ περιπίπτῃς ἑαυτῷ*.

Aeschin. 47, 13, *ἐτόλμησε δ' εἰπεῖν ὡς ἐγὼ τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ λόγοις περιπίπτω.*

Gregor. *In Jul.*, *οὕτως εὐάλωτόν ἐστιν ἡ πονηρία καὶ πανταχόθεν ἑαυτῇ περιπίπτουσα.*

I still think it possible that the 'boomerang' meaning of *peripeteia* may be connected with this use; but on the whole it is less likely to be, literally, 'a falling over oneself' than 'a falling out contrary,' 'a revolution of the whirligig of things,' 'a turning of the tables.' One may compare the technical use in the rhetoricians of *περιτροπή* to signify the device of hoisting an opponent with his own petard in argument. But here Bywater would agree; and we are as far as ever from settling *what* is reversed, the situation or the intention. The linguistic evidence seems to me, when all is said, inconclusive.

The real proof of the pudding lies in the eating; the real test of the meaning of *peripeteia*, since Aristotle's own definition is contested, remains, 'what will make sense?' This is the decisive battle-field, and this is the field which has so far been largely neglected. First, which makes better sense in the *Poetics*?

If *peripeteia* means 'reversal of the situation,' how is it possible for Aristotle to make the presence or absence of *π.* the basis of his main classification of tragedies (1452a, 12-18) as 'complex' or 'simple'? Can one divide dramas into those where the situation changes and those where it does not? The latter type must be all but non-existent up to M. Maeterlinck's invention of the 'Static Drama.' The *Iliad*, Aristotle's only named example of a 'simple' composition (*i.e.* without *peripeteia*), abounds, as has been pointed out already, in reversals of the situation. The usual way of evading this difficulty is to import, with no justification whatever, the adjective 'sudden.' But how, and why, divide tragedies into those which have sudden changes and those which have gradual ones? Is a play where the catastrophe takes fifty lines 'complex,' one where it takes a hundred 'simple'?

Besides, the *peripeteia* in ch. XI. of the *Poetics* has a logical connexion, which never seems to have been noticed, with the doctrine of the *ἁμαρτία*, or Tragic Error, in ch. XIII. (XII. being an admitted interpolation), and with the discussion of the various forms of plot in XIV. The *Poetics* may be, in Aristotle's phrase of what Nature is not, 'epeisodic like a bad tragedy'; but it is not quite so epeisodic and incoherent as is sometimes assumed.

The *peripeteia* is the working of that irony of Fate which makes life a tragedy of errors, so that we become the authors of our own undoing, like Lear, or like Othello kill the thing we love. Now in ch. XIV. (1453b, 15) Aristotle divides all the possible agents of the tragic calamity into (1) persons indifferent, (2) enemies, (3) friends or kin, and gives the preference to the last case, and to that action *in ignorance* which (unless love has turned to hate, as in the *Medea* or *Phoenissae*) it necessitates. For friends or kin will not ruin one another except through 'knowing not what they do.' The realisation may, Aristotle goes on, come in time (as in the *Cresphontes* and *Iphigeneia in Tauris*) or too late (as in the *Oedipus* or *Sohrab and Rustum*). But the important thing from our point of view is to see that Aristotle is here only confirming, from a different angle, his already expressed preference for the tragedy with *peripeteia* (in Vahlen's sense) and *anagnorisis*, and that there is a real connexion between these two things, which is hopelessly obscured when one talks about 'reversals' and 'recognitions.'

The *peripeteia* is the resulting from *blinded* human effort of the very opposite of its aim. The *anagnorisis* [which it is misleading to render 'recognition' instead of 'discovery'—Aristotle expressly says (1452a, 34-6) that it may be not only of persons, but also of *things* and *facts*] is the realisation of that blindness, the opening of the eyes that Ate, who 'hurts' men's minds, or Fate, or just human weakness had sealed —like the summer lightning that flashed at the supreme moment on David Balfour on the staircase of the House of Shaws.

This has ever been the stuff of the deepest tragedies of life as of literature; men have wrought unwitting,

> Then there came
> On that blind sin swift eyesight like a flame.

It is fantastic to call this sense of the *peripeteia* 'artificial'; it is the dark main-thread of tragic irony that runs through all the spinning of the Fates, the mockery of the life of man, 'Time's Laughing-stock.'

> He weaves and is clothed with derision,
> Sows and he shall not reap.

That is the real *peripeteia*, not any mere changing chance of circumstance; more tragic than all the tragedies of accident is the truth that, as Zeus observed long ago, men undo themselves.

Once this is recognised, another unnoticed connexion becomes clear: In XI. are discussed *peripeteia* and *anagnorisis;* in XIV. the effectiveness of tragic action in ignorance; XII. is an interpolation; XIII., discussing the ideal tragic hero, introduces the complementary doctrine of the *ἁμαρτία*, or Tragic Error. The *ἁμαρτία* (1453a, 10) is not necessarily a moral flaw at all, but simply (*cf.* Bywater *ad loc.*) a mistake. The best tragedy, says Aristotle, is the tragedy not of purposed Evil nor of chance Calamity, but of Error; the *ἁμαρτία* is the blind sowing of the wind, the *περιπέτεια* the whirlwind's reaping.

It should be clear which meaning of *peripeteia* best squares with Aristotle's tragic theory as a whole; compare tragic practice before and since, the result is the same—in poetry from Homer to Swinburne, in drama from *Genesis* to Ibsen. The idea is in Meredith:

> In tragic life, God wot,
> No villain need be! Passions spin the plot,
> We are betrayed by what is false within—

in *Lear:*

> The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
> Make instruments to plague us—

in one line of Juvenal:

> Magnaque numinibus uota exaudita malignis.

Similarly in dramatic practice the *peripeteia* is the essence of that earliest tragedy in Eden, when our first parents plucked the fruit that should make them as God, and 'knew not eating death'; and of the tragedy of Semele, praying to see Zeus in his glory and finding her own destruction. When Dejanira sends her lord the love-philtre that is to make him hers again, and only makes him Death's; when Oedipus runs headlong into the jaws of the doom he flees; when Jason, seeking a royal bride and other sons, brings his bride to the fire and his own sons to the sword; when Othello,

> Like the base Indian,
> Threw a pearl away richer than all his tribe;

when Macbeth is lured by jeering spirits to make his own perdition sure—all these are true peripeties. There are three at the close of *Hamlet* alone: the King, trying to poison Hamlet, poisons his Queen; trying to have him stabbed, brings the sword on himself; and Laertes dies by his own envenomed foil. There is a similar combination of *anagnorisis* and *peripeteia* at the close of Ibsen's *Doll's House.* 'It burst upon me,' says Nora when her husband has revealed his baseness at the close, 'that I had been living here eight years with a strange man.' And she walks out of the home she had been struggling so desperately to keep.

Such I believe to be the true meaning of *peripeteia*, both because Aristotle says so, and because it fits in with the theory of the *Poetics* and general tragic practice. But before closing I should like to notice that passage about the recognition of Odysseus by Eurycleia, *ἐκ περιπετείας* (1454b, 29), which Vahlen and Lock have left unexplained. 'By a turn of incident' (Butcher) will not do. This particular kind of *anagnorisis* is no more fortuitous than several of the others; nor would Aristotle, with his dislike of coincidence, have praised it if it were. 'All of a sudden' (Bywater) is even less satisfactory. Surely the point is that we have here, too, a genuine *peripeteia.* Odysseus had *himself* rejected the ministrations of the other handmaidens, because they were minxes, in favour of some old woman who would wash his feet decently and in peace; he forgot that Eurycleia was the very person who would recognise his scar. His device recoiled on his own head—one *peripeteia* more.

There is nothing more brilliant in the *Poetics* than this recognition by Aristotle of the Tragedy of Error, of the *peripeteia*, as the deepest of all. Life is like that, with its clash of

ignorant armies in the gloom. In vain we pray, like Ajax, to perish at least in the sunlight, seeing the faces of our foes; for the blindness Tiresias taunts in Oedipus is the blindness of all men, knowing not themselves, knowing not what they do.

They have much wisdom, yet they are not wise;
They have much goodness, yet they do not well;
They have much strength, and yet their doom is stronger;
Much patience, yet their time endureth longer;
Much valour, yet life mocks it with some spell.

F. L. LUCAS.

HORACE, *EPODE* XIII 3.

horrida tempestas caelum contraxit, et imbres
niuesque deducunt Iouem; nunc mare, nunc siluae
Threicio Aquilone sonant. rapiamus, amici,
occasionem de die, dumque uirent genua
et decet obducta soluatur fronte senectus.
tu uina Torquato moue consule pressa meo;
cetera mitte loqui: deus haec fortasse benigna
reducet in sedem uice.

VERSE 3 is usually printed thus, and anyone who reads it imagines for the moment that the poem is addressed to a company of friends, as *carm.* I 27 and 37 are addressed to 'sodales'. At verses 6 sq. he is undeceived: it is addressed to a single person. True, the words *tu uina moue* would not in themselves be irreconcilable with the plural *amici* if a distribution of offices were indicated, and if there followed another *tu* with another injunction, such as *ligna super foco repone.* But *cetera mitte loqui* is not a command which can be restricted to one of a company; the person so addressed is the only other person present.

Bentley therefore wrote *amice*, Baxter removed the two commas and made *amici* nominative; both have had several followers, yet neither can be right. For in none of his poems does Horace omit to name the friend whom he addresses, unless in a very different one, *carm.* II 5, where he is probably addressing himself. Scheibe accordingly suggested that *amici* was the corruption of some proper name such as *Apici.* But no corruption needs to be assumed: a proper name is there already, A m i c i. *C.I.L.* X 1403*d* 3 22 provides *L. Amicius Fortunatus* (from Herculaneum), and XIII 6385 adds *L. Amicius Donatus.* The quantity of the second syllable is visible in *C.I.G.* 3665 15 Ἀμεικιανός (the inscription is consistently correct in this particular), and as for the first, no name or word in Latin is known to begin with a long *am-* excepting compounds of the preposition *a;* for *amentum* is but a later spelling of *ammentum.*

A. E. HOUSMAN.

AESCHYLUS, *AG.* 40 FF.

δέκατον μὲν ἔτος τόδ' ἐπεὶ Πριάμου
μέγας ἀντίδικος,
Μενέλαος ἄναξ ἠδ' Ἀγαμέμνων,
διθρόνου Διόθεν καὶ δισκήπτρου
τιμῆς, ὀχυρὸν ζεῦγος Ἀτρειδᾶν, κτλ.

IF it is still true that πρὸς δύο οὐδ' Ηρακλῆς, it is a rash undertaking to question the authority of two editors of the *Classical Review.* But a long familiarity with the text impels me to protest against Professor Calder's analysis of the lines quoted above. The whole trouble arises from Hermann's removal of the comma after τιμῆς, which had satisfied the early editors of Aeschylus up to and including Porson and Blomfield, *quos honoris causa nomino.* Not content with this he added the cryptic remark: *aeque ad* τιμῆς *pertinet* ζεῦγος *atque ad* Ἀτρειδῶν. What exactly he meant I have no notion, but he certainly tempted his successors to indulge in strange contortions: see the notes of Paley, Wecklein, Kennedy, and Sidgwick, which, if space permitted, it would be instructive to quote in full. It is enough to say that whereas Sidgwick calls τιμῆς genitive of description after ζεῦγος Ἀτρειδᾶν (though he adds mysteriously that τιμῆς and Ἀτρειδᾶν are *parallel*, both being dependent on ζεῦγος), Kennedy holds that τιμῆς and

its epithets are in apposition to 'Ατρειδᾶν. Well indeed might Kennedy add: 'The construction is remarkable'!

I cannot, however, think that Professor Calder has chosen a safe path out of this morass by giving to ὀχυρόν an unexampled meaning. Why does he say that τιμῆς cannot be a descriptive genitive depending on the two proper names? That it does not depend on what follows I agree; but put back the comma and there should not be any difficulty in connecting it with what precedes. According to strict analysis I suppose the genitive to rest upon *μέγας ἀντίδικος*, a collective expression defined and interpreted by the appositional Μενέλαος . . . 'Αγαμέμνων; but I should be loth to assert that a descriptive genitive after a proper name is any more impossible in Greek than in Latin (Hor. *C.* 1. 36. 13). Goodwin on Demosth. 18. 296 remarks that the genitive of quality is as rare in Greek as it is common in Latin; but it exists all the same, although largely personal and poetical. If Professor Calder thinks that the presence of εἶναι makes any difference I will not quote Hdt. 1. 107, Aeschin. 3. 168, or even Thuc. 3. 45. But why Hdt. 7. 40 *ἅρμα ἵππων Νησαίων*, Eur. *Phoen.* 719 *τοῦθ' ὁρῶ πολλοῦ πόνου*, *ib.* 801 *ὦ ζαθέων πετάλων πολυθηρότατον νάπος*, Soph. *Ant.* 114 *λευκῆς χιόνος πτέρυγι*, *El.* 758 *μέγιστον σῶμα δειλαίας σποδοῦ*, *Ai.* 888 *τὸν μακρῶν ἀλάταν πόνων*, *ib.* 1003 *ὦ δυσθέατον ὄμμα καὶ τόλμης πικρᾶς* are not a sufficient defence for the use here I cannot understand. I have refrained from citing examples where the dependent noun has no epithet, as in *O.T.* 533. Observe that if the passage is so taken, *μέγας ἀντίδικος* is triply defined by (1) Μενέλαος . . . 'Αγαμέμνων, (2) διθρόνου . . . τιμῆς, (3) ὀχυρὸν ζεῦγος 'Ατρειδῶν.

A. C. PEARSON.

MOSSYNOS AND MOSSYNOIKOI.

οἶδα δὲ καὶ τοὺς περὶ Μόσσυνον τῆς Θράκης βοῦς, οἳ ἰχθῦς ἐσθίουσι παραβαλλομένους αὐτοῖς εἰς τὰς φάτνας (Athenaeus VIII., 35, 345e).

THERE can be no doubt that the reference is to the lake-dwellers of Prasias described by Herodotus V. 16, where the fish in the manger are also mentioned. Zenothemis, an author of whom I know only that Tzetzes grouped him with Pherenicus and Philostephanus as a romantic liar (Müller, *F.H.G.* III., p. 28), asserted that the cattle would only eat live fish and rejected dead ones, Aelian, *De nat. an.* XVII. 30. But this need not discredit Herodotus, for the fish diet of cattle is not unparalleled. In A.D. 1557, the islanders of Vardö in the White Sea had 'small store of catell which were fed on fish.'[1]

The fish-eating cattle have identified Mossynos with the lake-dwelling settlement on Prasias; from this it has then been assumed that Mossynos means a pile structure, and that the towers of the Mossynoikoi were of this character. This appears to be the accepted view (*e.g.* Stein, *ad Herod.* V. 16, whom How and Wells *ad loc.* are probably following, and Vollbrecht, *Xenophons Anabasis*, III., p. 163); the assumption, however, does not bear examination.

The Mossynoikoi, who inhabited the district behind Kerasund and Trebizond, were known to Hecataeus (Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Χοιράδες), and appear in the Persian administration and army lists (Herod. III. 94, VII. 78). Xenophon had dealings with them, and has described them in some detail (*Anab.* V. 4). Apollonius Rhodius II. 1015 ff. draws upon Xenophon and, either directly or through his elder contemporary Nymphodorus, upon Ephorus (see Scholiast on l. 1029). Indeed, except for the historical incident recorded by Strabo, and a worthless addition by Nicolas of Damascus (*Frag.* 126, *F.H.G.* III., p. 461), which is obviously coloured by the conventional virtues of the gentle savage, there is nothing in later authors which may not be derived from Xenophon or Ephorus.[2]

[1] Anthony Jenkinson in Hakluyt, *Voyages* (Glasgow, 1903), ii., p. 416.

[2] Valerius Flaccus V. 150, Pliny *N.H.* VI. 4, Mela I. 19, Suidas *s.v.* Μόσσυνες add nothing

Strabo XII. 19, 549 notes that the name Mossynoikoi was then obsolete, their modern name being Heptakometai, and he tells us that they massacred two maniples of Pompey's army whom they succeeded in drugging with the 'maddening' honey of the district. Dionysius of Halicarnassus I 26 uses the analogy of the Mossynoikoi to support his theory that the Etruscans took their name from *τύρσεις* 'towers.'

All our authors agree that this extremely primitive and savage people lived in towers, *πύργοι*, from which they took their name. Two peculiarities of these structures attracted their attention—(1) their material, which was wood; (2) their height, which according to Diodorus XIV. 30, 6 attained seven stories. While it is not impossible that they were erected on piles I can find no hint that they were, unless it be the phrase of Dionysius *ἐπὶ ξυλίνοις, ὡσπερὰν πύργοις, ὑψηλοῖς σταυρώμασι*. Again, Xenophon's account suggests that *mossynoi* were detached structures[1] not at all like a *terra-mara*, or a lake settlement, built upon a common platform; conversely these latter cannot have looked in the least like a tower. Indeed, had it not been for the passage in Athenaeus it would hardly have entered anybody's head that *mossynos* meant a pile structure.

Again, the life of these Pontic mountaineers was not that of lake dwellers. It is true that there were settlements in the marshes of the Phasis, which consisted of *οἰκήματα ξύλινα καὶ καλάμινα ἐν ὕδασι μεμηχανημένα* (Hippocrates, *περὶ ἀέρων*, 15, 61), presumably reed huts upon a wooden platform, but though Vollbrecht arbitrarily states that their inhabitants are without doubt a branch of the same people as the Mossynoikoi, the accounts of the two peoples show nothing at all in common except the use of canoes (*μονόξυλα*). The Mossynoikoi indeed selected the tops of ridges in an exceptionally precipitous country for their settlements, and Xenophon describes how they shouted across the narrow but deep valleys from village to village, and could thus communicate, though the distance to walk was upon the average about ten miles.

Of what race were these people, and is their name Greek? The word Mossynos, which Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics*, I., p. 143, regards as Anatolian or Scythian,[2] occurs elsewhere in Asia Minor. There is a Mossyna upon the Maeander in Phrygia, which is known from inscriptions and Byzantine records (Ramsay, *op. cit.*, I., pp. 122 ff.), and Pliny *N.H.* V. 126 mentions Mossyni in the *conventus* of Pergamum. Further, Athenaeus' statement, that Mossynos was a place-name in Thrace, is confirmed by the Thracian bishops of Mosynopolis in the ninth century after Christ, who are mentioned by Ramsay, *op. cit.* I., p. 158. In Xenophon's description of the war-dance and equipment of the Mossynoikoi there is nothing inconsistent with a Thracian origin, and like the Thracians they tattooed designs upon their white skins. Other peoples, it is true, have practised tattooing, and by itself this evidence is not conclusive, but at least it does not diminish the probability of their belonging to the Thraco-Phrygian stock.

That they were not Greeks is already clear in Herodotus, and they did not speak Greek. Xenophon, it will be remembered, had to employ an interpreter. It would therefore seem natural to suppose, in spite of Lidén, that *mossyn*, which is clearly a native word,

to our purpose. There are two curious but unconvincing glosses in Hesychius, *s.v.v.* Μοσσυνικὰ μαζονομεῖα and Μοσσύνοικοι, which go back to Didymus.

[1] It is even probable that the *mossyns* were not dwelling-houses but timber structures in the village, which served as refuges in case of attack. Thus each village of the Ossetes, a border folk of Iran, is said to contain one or more square towers, 40 to 60 feet high, built of stone, into which the inhabitants flee in time of danger. Klaproth, *Reise in den Kaukasus und nach Georgien*, II. (1814), p. 609, and Koch, *Reise durch Russland nach dem kaukasischen Isthmus in den Jahren* 1836-7-8, II. (1843) pp. 15, 113, quoted by E. Lidén, 'Folknamnet Mosynoiker,' *Strena Philologica Upsaliensis, Festskrift tillägnad Professor Per Persson*, 1922. I owe not only the reference, but also a summary of the contents of this paper, to the kindness of Mr. E. Harrison.

[2] The Scythian Mossynoikoi must rest upon the rather unconvincing gloss on Μόσσυνος in Hesychius, *ἐπάλξεις, πύργοι καὶ ἔθνος Σκυθικόν*.

was not Greek. It is, however, pretty certain both that it is Indo-Germanic, and that it means 'tower.' For although there seems to be no reference to any similar buildings in the other places with which the word is connected, the towers of the Ossete villages are called *mäsug* (West-Ossetic) or *mäsig* (East-Ossetic), which Lidén derives from an Old-Iranian **masŭ*-. I am less certain about the latter part of the word. Professor Calder,[1] to whom I owe the Anatolian references above, suggests that the *-οικοι* is simply the Greek spelling of a Pontic ethnicon, and has nothing to do with *οἶκος*. There is no doubt of course that the Greeks took the word to mean 'dwellers in mossyns,' but Greek etymology in such matters was not impeccable. I am personally inclined to think that Professor Calder's view is the more probable.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

[1] Professor Calder points out that the etymology favoured by the Greeks involves two considerable assumptions — viz., that the word corresponding to *οἶκος* in another Indo-Germanic language (*a*) lost the *F*, and (*b*) meant 'house.'

NOTES ON THE YOUNGER PLINY AND APULEIUS.

PLINY, *Panegyr.* 75. 6: 'quid nunc ego super ea, quae sum cum toto senatu precatus, pro senatu precer, nisi ut haereat animo tuo gaudium, quod tunc oculis protulisti, ames illum diem, et tamen uincas, noua merearis, noua audias? eadem enim dici nisi facta non possunt.'

The last sentence is universally emended. Some add (after 'nisi') 'ob eadem'—'eadem enim dici nisi <ob eadem> facta non possunt.' This is intolerably flat. Baehrens wrote 'nisi facta <noua assunt> non possunt.' This gives the right sort of sense for the final sentence: it is suitably paradoxical, but it is inconsistent with the preceding 'noua audias.' I suggest that Pliny wrote 'quid nunc . . . precer, nisi ut . . . noua merearis, [noua] audias <eadem>? eadem enim dici nisi facta <noua assunt> non possunt,' 'that you may win new laurels and hear the old praises: for the old praises can only be repeated if new deeds have been done.' Perhaps 'nisi <ob noua> facta' is an easier correction than that of Baehrens.

Pliny, *Panegyr.* 90. 6: 'habuerat hunc honorem periculis nostris diuus Nerua, ut nos, etsi minus ut bonos, promouere uellet, quia mutati saeculi signum et hoc esset, quod florerent, quorum praecipuum uotum antea fuerat, ut memoria principis elaberentur.'

The phrase 'etsi minus ut bonos' has long been suspected, though Keil and Kukula accept it. Lipsius read 'etsi minus notos, ut bonos tamen promouere uellet.' A simpler and more effective change is to insert 'quam ut bonus' after 'ut bonos': 'although his action was less an illustration of our virtues than of his own.'

Apuleius, *Metam.* VI. 22. 'interea Cupido amore nimio peresus et aegra facie, matris suae repentinam sobrietatem pertimescens, ad armillum redit, *etc.*'

Venus' sobriety is not obvious at any point of the story. In Chapter 11 she was reeling drunk. But shortly before she got drunk she resolved to call in her pet aversion, Sobriety: 'petamne auxilium ab inimica mea Sobrietate, quam propter huius ipsius luxuriam offendi saepius? a[u]t rusticae squalentisque feminae conloquium prorsus [adhibendum est] horresco. nec tamen uindictae solacium undeunde spernendum est. illa mihi prorsus adhibenda est nec ulla alia, quae castiget asperrime nugonem istum, faretram explicet et sagittas dearmet, arcum enodet, taedam deflammet, immo et ipsum corpus eius acrioribus remediis coherceat' (V. 30, Helm's text). It is plain that Cupid has every reason to dread Sobriety, who has not yet come upon the scene; and it is plain also that Sobriety is a definite person, as real as Venus' handmaids Sollicitudo and Tristities, who punish Psyche for her in VI. 9. Venus does not express the intention of turning sober herself. I suggest, therefore, that in VI. 22 we should print Sobrieta-

tem, and insert some noun after 'repentinam.' The most suitable word is 'sociam' — 'matris suae repentinam <sociam> Sobrietatem.' The metaphor exactly fits the passage from V. 30 quoted above, and the omission is easily intelligible. The scribe's eye passed from AMSO to AMSO—'repentin AMSO ci AMSO brietatem.' Some early editors printed Sobrietatem, and Oudendorp (as I discovered after making my emendation) suggested, though he did not print, '<seruam> or <seruulam> Sobrietatem': but Hildebrand ridiculed the suggestion, and since 1842 it seems to have been wholly forgotten. I think 'sociam' is preferable in sense, and also palaeographically, to 'seruam' or 'seruulam.'

Apuleius, *Metam.* VIII. 8. (the opening of the speech addressed by the murdered Tlepolemus' mutilated ghost to his wife Charite): 'Mi coniux, quod tibi prorsus ab alio dici non licebit: etsi pectore tuo iam permanat nostri memoria uel acerbae mortis meae casus foedus caritatis intercidit,—quouis alio felicius maritare, modo ne in Thrasylli manum sacrilegam conuenias.' The 'permanat' of the eleventh century MS. F (the source of all the rest) is obviously wrong; but the only suggestions which give a satisfactory sense are palaeographically improbable: for instance, Helm's 'permarcet,' and Gaselee's 'perimitur' (reading also 'pectori').

I suggest 'permanca.' The word is not found, but Latin is full of 'per' compounds of this type, which often occur no more than once. Cicero has a very great number, and Apuleius is fond of them. The metaphorical use of 'mancus' occurs several times in Cicero's writings; and the word is very appropriate to the mangled Tlepolemus. Perhaps preferable to 'permanca' is the suggestion 'perit manca,' made to me by Mr. E. Harrison. Palaeographically, in Beneventan (the script of F, and probably of F's immediate ancestor) 'ca' and 'at' are extremely close. F shows many certain instances of the confusion of both 'a' and 'c' with 't.' Helm has collected examples in the preface to his *Florida*, 1910, pp. xli ff. Probably 'in' should be inserted before 'pectore tuo.'

D. S. ROBERTSON.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS X. 60.

IT is remarkable that in the Epistle to Herodotus (*D.L.* x. 35-83) the downward tendency of the atom is not explicitly stated. Before § 60 the atoms have been declared to be in incessant motion (§ 43); two species of motion have been mentioned, both implying previous collision—namely, (*a*) vibration or oscillation of the imprisoned atom, (*b*) rebound of the *un*-imprisoned atom to a distance whether in a lateral or an upward direction (§§ 43, 44). There is no explicit mention by Epicurus in this Epistle of either fall or swerve. However, in § 61 (Usener, *Epicurea*, p. 19, 1 and 2), the downward motion (*ἡ κάτω φορά*), due to weight, is incidentally mentioned and contrasted with the upward or lateral motions, due to collision. Now the drift of § 60 is perfectly plain. On the assumption that Epicurus held the doctrine that the atom, like everything else possessed of weight, tends to move in a certain empirically determined direction—or, as we say, to fall downwards—he is in § 60 attempting to meet the objection raised by Aristotle and others against Democritus, that in what is unlimited there is no up or down. Aristotle asks, *Physics* iii. 5. 205 b 30 *πῶς τοῦ ἀπείρου ἔσται τὸ μὲν ἄνω, τὸ δὲ κάτω, ἢ ἔσχατον, ἢ μέσον;* cf. iv. 8, 215 a 8, where he answers his own query; also Cicero *de finibus* i. § 17 'in infinito inani, in quo nihil nec summum nec infimum nec medium nec intimum nec extremum sit.' This Epicurus grants if 'up' and 'down' are used in an absolute sense, as implying a zenith or nadir, a highest or lowest extremity, of the universe. But he goes on to defend the use of the terms in a relative sense, and to deny that the same direction can be at once both 'up' and 'down' with reference to the same point of space. The first sentence and the latter part of the

section, which present little difficulty, may be translated thus:

'Furthermore, we must not assert "up" or "down" of that which is unlimited as if there were a zenith or a nadir. . . .' Going on at *ὥστε ἔστι* (Usener, p. 18, 8): 'Hence it is possible to assume one direction of motion, which we conceive as extending upwards *ad infinitum*, and another downwards, even if it should happen ten thousand times that what moves from us to the spaces above our heads reaches the feet of those above us, or that which moves downwards from us the heads of those below us. None the less is it true that the whole of the motion in the respective cases is conceived as extending in opposite directions *ad infinitum*.' So much is clear. But the intermediate sentence (Usener, p. 18, lines 5-8) does not appear to have been, as yet, made out. Cobet had read *ἴσμεν τοι τὸ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς, ὅθεν ἂν θῶμεν εἰς ἄπειρον ἄγειν ὄν, μηδέποτε φανεῖσθαι τοῦτο ἡμῖν, ἢ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ νοηθέντος εἰς ἄπειρον ἅμα ἄνω τ' εἶναι καὶ κάτω πρὸς τὸ αὐτό*. But his translation (*istud* for *τοῦτο*) does not inform us what it is that the 'space overhead' will 'appear.' Usener has *εἰς μέντοι τὸ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς, ὅθεν ἂν στῶμεν, εἰς ἄπειρον τεῖνον μηδέποτε φανεῖσθαι τοῦτο ἡμῖν· κ.τ.λ.*, substituting a colon at *ἡμῖν* for Cobet's comma.

With this Tescari agrees, his punctuation being the same, except that instead of Usener's emendation *τεῖνον* he keeps *ἄγειν ὄν* of two inferior MSS. and the *editio princeps* for which the better MSS. give *ἄγειν ὄν*. In my judgement Usener is right in introducing *μέντοι*, but wrong in rejecting *ἴσμεν* and *ἄγειν ὄν*. Bignone (*Epicuro*, p. 95, note 1) puts in parenthesis *εἰς μέντοι . . . ἡμῖν*, while retaining *ἄγειν* and adding *<νοοῦσι, δῆλ>ον*, in place of *ὄν*. He then translates: 'If, however, from any point where we are, we proceed, in thought, *ad infinitum* overhead, it is clear that we shall never find this limit,' *i.e.* the zenith. Kochalsky, p. 67, has no better resource than to bracket *ἄγειν ὄν*, which he says must go (as a duplicate of *ἄπειρον*), and to read *<ἐλπ>ὶς μέντοι* instead of Usener's *εἰς μέντοι*. But his objection that Usener's *τεῖνον* requires at least *τι* before it seems to me sound.

First I will call attention to the repetition of the disjunctive, 18. 4 *τὸ ἄνω ἢ κάτω*, 18. 6 *τοῦτο ἢ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ νοηθέντος εἰς ἄπειρον*, 18. 12 *πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἐπάνω . . . ἀφικνῆται ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τῶν ὑποκάτω*. In all three cases Epicurus seems pedantically anxious to include in a single clause terms suitable either to 'up' or to 'down.' The two directions go together. Accordingly, *τοῦτο* after *φανεῖσθαι* in 18. 6 I take to refer to something above us; not Bignone's zenith, but *τὸ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς* (l. 5). In other words, *τοῦτο* is resumptive and subject, not predicate, of *φανεῖσθαι*. When this has been settled, the rest falls into place. A future infinitive must have some verb to depend upon; even Bignone introduces *νοοῦσι*. But there is no need. The Borbonicus, our best MS., reads *ἴσμεν τοι*, not *εἰς μέντοι*. But the punctuation requires revision. A comma, or even a dash, after *ἡμῖν*, and a second comma or a complementary dash after *ἄπειρον* (l. 7), will enable us to take *ἅμα ἄνω τε εἶναι καὶ κάτω πρὸς τὸ αὐτό* as the complement of *φανεῖσθαι*, applying just as much to *τοῦτο* = *τὸ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς* as to its other subject after *ἢ*, namely, *τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ νοηθέντος εἰς ἄπειρον*. Thus I take the text of the best MS., with a single alteration *μέντοι* for *τοι*, and translate:

'As to the space overhead, however, if it be possible to draw a line to infinity from the point where we stand, we know that never will this space—or, for that matter, the space below the supposed standpoint if produced to infinity—appear to us to be at the same time "up" and "down" with reference to the same point; for this is inconceivable.'

With *ἄγειν ὄν*, 'it being possible to draw,' cf. *ἔστι μίαν λαβεῖν*, Usener 18. 8 and 9. There is no need then to alter *ὄν* into *ἐξόν* with Giussani (*Studi*, p. 168). With *τὸ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς* it is possible to understand 'point,' or 'space,' or merely 'region'—that is, direction. Those editors who retain the colon after *ἡμῖν* generally make *τοῦτο* the predicate, understanding by *τοῦτο* the apex or zenith of the

universe—*i.e.*, a point or extremity. But if we compare p. 18, 12 (Usener) εἰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἡμῶν τόπους we shall incline to supply 'space' rather than 'point.' I confess I cannot follow the latest German translator, who adopts Usener's εἰς μέντοι κ.τ.λ. and treats ἢ as introducing a *reductio ad absurdum* = 'or else.' Thus he renders the whole sentence: 'In the upward direction overhead from a point arbitrarily chosen, this highest point will never be visible to us; or else what is underneath the imaginary <line> running to infinity is then both above and below with reference to the same point.' I leave others to judge whether this is a cogent conclusion. My own interpretation makes Epicurus say: 'If we could get to infinity in either direction, whether overhead or underfoot, this same infinity will be either up *or* down—it cannot possibly be both up *and* down—in reference to the same point.'

R. D. HICKS.

THE POLITICAL SYMPATHIES OF SERVIUS SULPICIUS RUFUS.

As we read the famous letter of condolence which Servius Sulpicius Rufus wrote to Cicero on the death of Tullia, the writer impresses us as a conservative of Cicero's type, who is accepting with dignity but perforce and in deep sorrow the inevitable rule of the victor, Caesar. It is, then, with some surprise that we find Long[1] classifying him as apparently a 'partisan of Caesar,' Heitland[2] counting him as finally a Caesarian, and Strachan-Davidson[3] describing him as a weakling who was too timid to join Cicero's flight to Pompey, and had so far committed himself to Caesar's side that he had to count as a Caesarian. On the other hand, Boissier[4] puts him with the Pompeians, Tyrrell and Purser[5] recognise his Pompeian sympathies, while Watson,[6] Süpfle-Boeckel[7] and, apparently, Abbott[8] regard him as a neutral.

A brief examination of the evidence shows how such a divergence of opinion might arise among casual readers of Cicero's letters; but a wider survey of the material as a whole leaves one fairly certain about the political sympathies of this interesting man.

The pieces of evidence which have led good scholars to place him on Caesar's side are not numerous; furthermore, they appear on their face to be more conclusive than they prove to be on examination.

In the year 51 B.C. Sulpicius, as consul, took the part of Caesar against his colleague, Marcellus, who was the enemy of Caesar and a partisan of Pompey. Dio says[9] that Sulpicius did this in the interests of fair play; in other words, as an honest man with deep respect for law would naturally do.

Much more positive is the next piece of evidence. At the end of March or in early April, 49 B.C., Sulpicius' son is in the camp of Caesar, which is besieging Pompey at Brundisium. Furthermore, Cicero says[10] that the youth was sent by his father *ad effligendum Pompeium aut certe capiendum cum Pontio Titiniano*. About April 5 Sulpicius himself seems to have entered Caesar's senate—not very willingly, however, for he and Tullus complain that Caesar has not excused them from this duty as he had excused Cicero. Cicero regards[11] their objections to entering the senate as ridiculous, in view of the fact that they had already done something much more serious, viz., had sent their sons *ad Cn. Pom-*

[1] Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, III (1864), p. 946.
[2] *Pro Murena*[2] (1876), pp. 14-15.
[3] *Cicero and the Fall of the Roman Republic*, p. 337.
[4] *Cicero and His Friends*,[2] p. 296.
[5] *The Correspondence of Cicero*, 4, pp. lxxvii-lxxviii.
[6] *Cicero, Select Letters*[3] (1881), *ad Fam.* 4, 4, 2.
[7] *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae Selectae*[10] (1893), *ad Fam.* 4, 1.
[8] *Selected Letters of Cicero* (1897), *ad Fam.* 6, 6, 10 and 4, 5.
[9] Dio 40, 59 (see, however, Boissier, *l. c.*); cf. Suet. *Div. Iulius*, 29.
[10] *Ad Att.* 9, 19, 2; cf. 9, 9, 1; 9, 18, 2.
[11] *Ad Att.* 10, 3a, 2.

peium circumsedendum. However, these two unqualified statements, that Sulpicius sent his son to besiege Pompey, lose something of their weight when we discover the passage,[1] written to Atticus a few days later, in which Cicero appears to refer to Sulpicius (though not by name) as *istum qui filium Brundisium de pace misit*, and then he adds *de pace idem sentio quod tu, simulationem esse apertam, parari autem acerrime bellum*. Now we know that at about this time the senate was ordering that ambassadors be sent to Pompey concerning peace.[2] Of course, we also know that such *legati* were never sent;[3] but, in view of this action of the senate in authorising the embassy and in view of Sulpicius' deep desire for peace, it[4] is not impossible to believe that Cicero had spoken too positively when he charged Sulpicius with sending his son against Pompey, and that in this passage he was unjust in discarding so scornfully the motive of a mission of peace. Indeed, the rest of Cicero's sceptical remark,[5] in spite of some uncertainty in the text, gives colour to the conjecture that a slight jealousy of Sulpicius led Cicero to discredit the good intentions of his friend.

Tyrrell and Purser make the interesting suggestion[6] that the person really responsible for the presence of young Servius in Caesar's army was not his father but his 'restless and energetic' mother, Postumia. They cite no evidence for this conjecture, but we know[7] that Postumia was among those well-known women whose relations with Julius Caesar were the subject of unpleasant comment, and whom he always seemed able to keep inspired with eager concern for his fortunes. But whatever the influence which sent the youth to Brundisium, he was apparently back again in about a month.[8] Early in May Sulpicius visits Cicero to consult with him about their duty in the crisis, especially about following Pompey, and is evidently embarrassed by the fact of his son's recent service at Brundisium.[9]

The fact that Sulpicius entered Caesar's senate in the spring of 49 B.C. does not necessarily place him among Caesar's partisans. That would depend entirely upon what he said and how he voted there. We know that Caesar encountered opposition from the senate; for example, Caelius writes[10] *iratus senatui exiit, his intercessionibus plane incitatus est*. In that famous interview at Formiae, when Caesar vainly tried to persuade Cicero to go to Rome and attend his senate, Cicero explains[11] what he should have to say, if he went: '"I shall speak along this line, that the senate does not approve an expedition into Spain, nor sending armies into Greece, and I shall express great regret concerning Pompey." To this Caesar replied, "Of course, I do not wish that sort of thing said." "So I thought," said I, "but I cannot be present on this account, because either I must say these things and many things which I could not pass over if I were there, or I cannot come."' Now, we know[12] that Sulpicius felt about peace and about the expedition to Spain exactly as Cicero felt. Whether Sulpicius actually voiced this feeling in the senate we do not know certainly. Süpfle-Boeckel[13] and Eduard Meyer[14] say that he did, but it is possible that the passage[15] which is cited as proof does not imply so much as that.

---

[1] *Ad Att.* 10, 1, 4.

[2] *Ad Att.* 10, 3.

[3] Dio implies (41, 16) that Caesar was responsible for their failure to go. Caesar himself says (*De Bello Civili*, 33) that on account of fear no one could be found to serve as *legatus: Pompeius enim discedens ab urbe in senatu dixerat eodem se habiturum loco qui Romae remansissent et qui in castris Caesaris fuissent.*

[4] *Ad Fam.* 4, 2, 3; 4, 3, 1; 6, 1, 6.

[5] The whole passage reads: *Istum qui filium Brundisium de pace misit* (*de pace idem sentio quod tu, simulationem esse apertam, parari autem acerrime bellum*), *me legatum iri non arbitror, cuius adhuc, ut optavi, mentio facta nulla sit.—ad Att.* 10, 1, 4. Cf. Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*[2], 3, 397-398.

[6] *The Correspondence of Cicero*, 4, p. lxxviii.

[7] Suet. *Div. Iulius*, 50: cf. Boissier, *Cicero and his Friends*[3], pp. 295-296.

[8] *Ad Fam.* 4, 2, 1.

[9] *Ad Att.* 10, 14, 3.

[10] *Ad Fam.* 8, 16, 1.

[11] *Ad Att.* 9, 18 1.

[12] *Ad Fam.* 4, 1, 1.

[13] *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae Selectae*[10] (1893), *ad Fam.* 4, 1.

[14] *Caesars Monarchie u. das Principat des Pompeius*[2] (1919), p. 350.

[15] *Ad Fam.* 4, 1, 2 (sic! 4, 1, 1): *cui quidem ego, cum me rogaret ut adessem in senatu, eadem omnia, quae a te de pace et de Hispaniis dicta sunt, ostendi me esse dicturum.*

The remaining argument of those who would place Sulpicius among Caesar's partisans is the fact of his acceptance at Caesar's hands of the governorship of Achaia in 46 B.C. But Caesar's offer of the post is no proof of Sulpicius' Caesarian sympathies; it is rather to be set down to that wise, pacific policy of Caesar of which Cicero has often spoken and which he illustrates once more in the following passage,[1] where he groups together some conspicuous cases of former enemies whom the victor has chosen to honour; *at nos quem ad modum est complexus! Cassium sibi legavit, Brutum Galliae praefecit, Sulpicium Graeciae, Marcellum, cui maxime suscensebat, cum summa illius dignitate restituit.* Sulpicius seems to have accepted the office only after careful deliberation, and later to have had misgivings as to the wisdom of his decision,[2] but Cicero is sure that the decision was advantageous for Sulpicius and for the people concerned.[3]

The trend of all the remaining evidence is plainly this. Sulpicius foresees[4] civil war as early as 51 B.C. and he hates it.[5] He is conservative by training and temperament,[6] preferring the *bona causa*, but feeling no more confidence in Pompey than in Caesar.[7] As late as May 8, 49 B.C. he is consulting Cicero concerning their duty,[8] as if, having maintained his neutrality so far, he could still choose his course of action. This is after his son's expedition to Brundisium and his own appearance in Caesar's senate. Whether he finally went to Pompey's camp in Greece is uncertain. A single passage in the thirteenth Philippic[9] is the only evidence on this point, and scholars differ as to its interpretation. But, whether Sulpicius ever went to Pompey's camp or not, the passage in question includes him in a group of ten *consulares*, all the rest of whom were recognised Pompeians, and it concludes with the following words: *certe iis consularibus non esset Pompeianus despiciendus senatus.*

That he ultimately came to regard himself as an opponent of Caesar would seem to be indicated by the fact that after Pharsalia he withdrew to Asia:[10] in 47 B.C. we find him lecturing on *ius pontificium* at Samos.[11] Why did he leave Italy if he felt in sympathy with the victor? It was in the east that the vanquished Pompeians were gathering to make a new stand against Caesar or to await amnesty at his hands.

The more one studies the conflict of 49 B.C. the more comprehensible becomes the hesitation of thoughtful men to commit themselves to either side. The reactions of Servius Sulpicius Rufus were remarkably like those of Cicero. If Sulpicius did not actually go so far as Cicero in following Pompey to Greece, we have only to remember that probably Cicero would not have done so but for that tremendous sense of personal obligation to Pompey as the man who had brought about his recall from exile.[12] Both Sulpicius and Cicero longed for peace. As between the leaders, Caesar and Pompey, they found little to choose; but to identify oneself with those lawless elements which were rallying under Caesar's banner must have seemed to the great jurist, even more than we know it seemed to the orator,[13] a betrayal of the cause of constitutional government, to which both were at heart devoted.

Servius Sulpicius Rufus is conspicuous among the men of all time for the respect and honour in which he was

[1] *Ad Fam.* 6, 6, 10.
[2] *Ad Fam.* 4, 4, 2 and 5.
[3] *Ad. Fam.* 4, 4, 2 and 5; 13, 28a.
[4] *Ad Fam.* 4, 1, 1; 4, 3, 1.
[5] *Ad Fam.* 6, 1, 6.
[6] Cic. *Brut.*, 151-156; *pro Murena*, 15-53.
[7] *Ad Att.* 10, 14, 1.
[8] *Ad Att.* 10, 14.
[9] End of s. 28, s. 29. For use of *senatus* (s. 28) as equivalent to *castra*, see s. 26. Hofmann-Sternkopf *Ausgewählte Briefe von M. Tullius Cicero*[7] [1898], introd. note to Ep. 18 [*ad Fam.* 4, 2] think that Sulpicius was at Pompey's camp: King (*Phil.* 13, 28) and Süpfle-Boeckel (*op. cit.*, introd. note to Ep. 80) say he was not; Watson (*op. cit.*, Ep. 99, s. 3) regards the matter as doubtful. The only references of Cicero to Sulpicius' feeling about following Pompey indicate the greatest hesitation to do so: see, *e.g.*, Cic. *ad Att.* 10, 14, 1 and 3.
[10] *Ad Att.* 11, 7, 4; *ad Fam.* 4, 5, 4.
[11] Cic. *Brut.* 156.
[12] *Ad Att.* 8, 15, 2; 9, 11a, 2; 9, 7, 4; etc.
[13] *Ad Att.* 7, 3, 5; 9, 18, 2; 9, 19, 1.

held by his contemporaries. That he was not lacking in courage when he had a clear conviction of duty is proved not only by this reputation, but also by his last public act, when, knowing that it was at the peril of his life, he set out for Mutina on a mandate from the senate, as Cicero says,[1] 'not refusing to try with his last breath if he might bring some aid to his country.'

CATHARINE SAUNDERS.

Vassar College.

[1] *Phil.* 9, 2.

ARISTOPHANES, *BIRDS* 700.

πρότερον δ' οὐκ ἦν γένος ἀθανάτων, πρὶν Ἔρως συνέμιξεν ἅπαντα.

THE point I wish to make has probably occurred to others, but I have not found this line examined in detail in any edition. It is recognised that the opening of the Parabasis contains, besides Hesiodic and Orphic elements, some borrowings from the philosophers; so Merry (on 684 ff.) refers to 'the dicta of the Ionian physicists, of Empedocles and Anaxagoras.' Other editors refer to Anaxagoras for line 700. The scholiast makes no suggestion.

συνέμιξεν may recall the Anaxagorean fragment (17 Mull.) *οὐδὲν γὰρ χρῆμα γίνεται οὐδὲ ἀπόλλυται, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ ἐόντων χρημάτων συμμίσγεται καὶ διακρίνεται.* But this applies to the *γενέσεις* of present existence; the primal function of *νοῦς* in dealing with chaos was not to mix, but the reverse—*ὁμοῦ πάντα χρήματα ἦν· εἶτα νοῦς ἐλθὼν αὐτὰ διεκόσμησε* (Diog. Laert. II. 3).

The resemblance to Empedocles' thought is much stronger. In his system, Φιλότης mingles into an undifferentiated mass the unmixed *ῥιζώματα* which are conversely separated out by Νεῖκος. It is during the intermediate stages of either world-process that organised life becomes possible; and the effect of the advance of Φιλότης is mentioned in several fragments.

202 (Mull.) *αἶψα δὲ θνήτ' ἐγένοντο τὰ πρὶν μάθον ἀθάνατ' εἶναι.*

184 *τῶν δέ τε μισγομένων χεῖτ' ἔθνεα μυρία θνητῶν, | παντοίῃς ἰδέῃσιν ἀρηρότα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι.*

310 *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μεῖζον ἐμίσγετο δαίμονι δαίμων, | ταῦτά τε συμπίπτεσκεν, ὅπῃ συνέκυρσεν ἕκαστα, | ἄλλα τε πρὸς τοῖς πολλὰ διηνεκῆ ἐξεγένοντο.*

68 *ἄλλοτε μὲν Φιλότητι συνερχόμεν' εἰς ἓν ἅπαντα. . . .*

Here *ἀθάνατα* and *δαίμονες* are the unmixed *ῥιζώματα*, and *θνητά* the temporary 'mortal aggregates.' Empedocles has no place for a theogony, and obviously Aristophanes' *γένος ἀθανάτων* is not an echo of him but of Hesiod. But these fragments seem a reasonable source of the phrase *Ἔρως συνέμιξεν ἅπαντα.*

Empedocles calls the combining force Φιλότης, Ἀφροδίτη or Κύπρις. He does not use Ἔρως in any of the extant fragments. But, given this diversity of names, it would seem quite characteristic of Aristophanes to prefer Ἔρως where the rest of his passage demands it. Cf. *Clouds* 379, where the *περιχώρησις* of Anaxagoras appears as *Δῖνος—τὸν Δί' ἐξελαυνῶ.*

DOROTHY TARRANT.

INTERLINEAR HIATUS IN THE ODES OF HORACE.

VERRALL (*Studies in Horace*, pp. 173 ff.) asserts that Horace, especially when writing in Sapphics, is very careful to observe synapheia, save for 'deviations . . . permitted or required by the sense,' *i.e.* interlinear hiatus is admitted if, and only if, there is a decided break in the structure, caused by a change of subject (as I. iii. 8) or an emotional pause (as III. xi. 50). As this misleading statement does not appear to have been contradicted, at least in a form readily available to British students, it seems worth while briefly to give the facts of the case.

Synapheia is neglected, *i.e.* a line of an ode ends in a vowel alone or followed by *—m* when the next line begins with a vowel or *h*, 143 times in the 3,094 lines of the odes (text of Wickham-Garrod). This includes the *Carmen Saeculare*. The average per 100 lines is 4·6 instances, which shows a tendency to avoid such hiatus, for four random samples of 100 hexameters each from Horace and Vergil give from 8 to 14 instances, notwithstanding the fact that both authors occasionally treat the hexameter as having synapheia (as *Sat.* I. ii. 62; *Aen.* VI. 602). Of these 143 instances, 49 occur in Alcaics, or 51 if we read *altricis* for *nutricis* in III. iv. 11, *Aetnam* for *Aetnen*, *ibid.* 76. This is 3·8 per cent. (4·02 per cent.). There are 37, or 4·2 per cent., in Sapphics; 44, or 5·3 per cent., in Asclepiadics; and 13, or 7·2 per cent., in other metres. By far the commonest hiatus is at the end of a stanza; if we deduct these cases, there remain but 73 instances in all, the percentage for the various metres being then 2·05, 2·3, 2·5, and 3·7. Under 'stanza' is included couplet in the 'second' Asclepiadic odes and such pieces as I. iv., vii., viii. In all positions, synapheia is most likely to be neglected after a long syllable; this accounts for some 75 per cent. of the examples. Punctuation does not seem to matter; a dozen instances or so coincide with a change in the subject-matter, and the example above given of an emotional break is the only one we can find.

Horace clearly liked this neglect of synapheia less as he grew older. The first book has, within the stanza or couplet, 40 cases of it; the second, 14; the third, 12 only, desp te its length; the fourth, 7. In other words, the early work has more cases than all the rest.

The instances which we have found are as follows, and are analysed in the subjoined table:

Alcaics:
I. ix. 7, 14; xvi. 16, 27; xvii. 6, 13, 16, 25; xxxi. 5, 14; xxxv. 9, 12, 32, 38; xxxvii. 11.
II. i. 12; iii. 12, 24; v. 9; ix. 3, 12; xiii. 4, 7, 8, 11, 21, 26, 28; xiv. 3; xvii. 4, 20; xix. 31.
III. ii. 17, 24; iii. 8, 40; iv. 4, (9), 16, 28, 72, (76); v. 10, 11, 12, 24, 36, 46; xxiii. 16.
IV. iv. 4; xv. 10.
49 (51) examples in 1,268 lines.

Sapphics:
I. ii. 6, 16, 41, 47; xii. 4, 6, 7, 8, 25, 31, 40; xxii. 15; xxv. 18; xxx. 6; xxxii. 12.
II. ii. 6; iv. 6; vi. 8, 12; viii. 8, 16; x. 4; xvi. 5, 28.
III. viii. 8; xi. 29, 32, 50; xiv. 4; xx. 8; xxvii. 10, 33, 36, 48.
IV. vi. 12; xi. 12. C. S. 60.
37 examples in 820 lines.

Asclepiadics:
I. i. 11, 18; iii. 8, 24, 33; xi. 7; xiv. 5; xv. 2, 18, 32; xviii. 11, 14, 15; xix. 8; xxi. 12; xxiii. 3, 7; xxiv. 13; xxxiii. 4. 12; xxxvi. 16.
II. xii. 5, 27.
III. vii. 30; ix. 22; xv. 4, 10; xvi. 8; xix. 3; xxiv. 11, 24, 61; xxviii. 4.
IV. i. 16, 18, 20, 24, 27; iii. 16; v. 5; viii. 17, 24; x. 2; xiii. 1.
44 examples in 826 lines.

Other metres:
I. iv. 9; vii. 8, 25, 29; viii. 3; xxviii. 6, 17, 23, 28.
II. xviii. 5, 8, 18, 30.
III. and IV. no instances.
13 examples in 180 lines.

In computing instances of hiatus between stanza and stanza in the following table, the 'second' Asclepiadic is regarded as a series of couplets; but Asclepiadic lines occurring *κατὰ στίχον*, as in I. i., xi., are regarded as forming four-line stanzas, IV. viii. being considered to have lost two lines.

'Bk. IV.' includes the *C. S.*

	1¯.	1˘.	1m.	2¯.	2˘.	2m.	3¯.	3˘.	3m.	4¯.	4˘.	4m.	*Total.*	*Heavy Punct.*	*Light Punct.*	*No Punct.*
Alcaics, Bk. I. ...	3	1	1	3	—	—	2	1	—	4	—	—	15 (11)	3	2	10
" " II. ...	1	—	—	1	—	—	4	1	1	6	1	2	17 (8)	5	4	8
" " III. ...	1	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	10	—	1	15 (4)	8	3	4
" " IV. ...	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	2 (1)	—	1	1
Sapphics, Bk. I. ...	2	—	—	4	—	—	2	—	2	3	1	1	15 (10)	2	5	8
" " II.	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	9 (3)	6	3	—
" " III.	1	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	5	1	—	10 (4)	7	1	2
" " IV.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	3 (0)	3	—	—
Ascl., Bk. I. ...	2	—	1	2	—	1	5	1	1	7*	—	1*	21 (13)	9	5	7
" " II. ...	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	— (2)	—	1	1
" " III. ...	2	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	5*	—	1*	10 (4)	4	3	3
" " IV. ...	4	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	5*	—	—	11 (6)	4	3	4
Other,† Bk. I. ...	3	1	2	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	9 (6)	3	1	5
" " II. ...	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4 (1)	1	—	3
" " III. ...	None															
" " IV. ...	None															
Total													143 (73)	55	32	56

1¯, etc. = after first, etc., line, which ends in a long vowel or diphthong.
1˘, etc. = " " " " short vowel.
1m, etc. = " " " " +m.
* Including the *second* line of a couplet of 'Second' Asclepiad.
† Couplets only.

H. J. ROSE.
H. PRITCHARD-WILLIAMS.

NOTES ON ATHENAEUS.

14C. Homer sang of Ares and Aphrodite *ἀποτρέπων αὐτοὺς παρανόμων ὀρέων. ὀάρων*, 'dallyings' is a possible reading.

32C. *ἦν ἄρ' ἔπος τόδ' ἀληθές, ὅ τ' οὐ μόνον ὕδατος αἶσαν*
ἀλλά τι καὶ λεύχης οἶνος ἔχειν ἐθέλει.
For *λεύχης* we may perhaps read *λέσχης*.

238E. Antiphanes, 'Ancestors' (*K.* II. 94). A parasite says:
τοῖς φίλοις
τοιοῦτός εἰμι δη τις τύπτεσθαι μύδρος.
εἰμ', ἡδιστε, τ. μ. may be the original.

258A. A flatterer of the type just described should be called *μαλακοκόλαξ. πρὸς γὰρ τῷ τοιούτῳ κολακεύειν καὶ τὸ σχῆμα . . . ἀποπλάτ-*

τεται. C. reads πρὸς γὰρ τῷ οὕτω. The true text may then be πρὸς γάρ τοι τῷ οὕτω κολακεύειν, τοι and τῷ being transposed.

605F. Cleisophos tried to embrace the statue of Aphrodite, but, being repelled by the coldness and solidity of the stone, he desisted, καὶ προβαλλόμενος τὸ σαρκίον ἐπλησίασεν.

We may read τὸ σηρικόν.

T. W. LUMB.

HERODAS, *MIMES* III 93.

τὴν γλάσσαν ἐς μέλι πλύνας. Knox-Headlam, p. 161, contains a slip, which is perhaps worth correcting. Against the view of Ellis that this phrase has some connection with the rites of initiation into the Mithraic grade of 'Lions' it is there argued 'it is *the tongue* here, not the hands, which is to be washed with honey.' This betrays a misapprehension of the facts. If the study of Porphyry, *de antro nympharum*, 15, is prolonged to the sentence immediately following that of which a part is quoted, it will become apparent that in the Mithraic rite tongue, as well as hands, was purified with honey. καθαίρουσι δὲ καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν τῷ μέλιτι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἁμαρτωλοῦ.

The statement that 'it is questionable whether Herodas can possibly have been acquainted with Mithraic cult' is perfectly accurate. It is questionable, but not out of the question, and the balancing of probabilities is perhaps more delicate than the note suggests. On the one hand it is quite true that Mithras is absent from Hellenistic Delos, that the god 'had not even learned to speak Greek' (Lucian, *Deor. Con.* 9) and that until the advent of Pompey's pirate prisoners there is little trace of Greek or Roman interest in Mithraism. On the other hand, it may be remembered that the artistic type of Mithras slaying the bull was indisputably fixed by some Greek artist of the Pergamene school.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

THE GELENIAN *CODICES* OF LIVY.

As the MSS. of Livy used by Sigismundus Gelenius and Beatus Rhenanus for their edition of the historian, which appeared at Basle in 1535, have apparently perished, it is natural to treat their reports with caution. It is well known that in such cases the moral honesty, as well as the careful observation, of old editors has to be considered by the modern critic. I am glad, therefore, to be able to furnish a confirmation of the trust reposed in Gelenius by Messrs. Conway and Walters (in the 'praefatio' to their edition of Livy, Books VI.-X., § 42), from a parallel case that has come under my notice.

In 1550 the same Gelenius issued in the same city of Basle an edition of Tertullian. In it a very large number of readings appear which were otherwise unknown until the other day. In this case, as in the other, the MSS. quoted have perished. But a twelfth-century MS. of Tertullian has turned up at Troyes (No. 523, formerly of Clairvaux), which was certainly not a Gelenian codex, and yet it offers nearly every one of the readings (in the *De Carnis Resurrectione*) cited as *Gel.* in the edition of certain of Tertullian's works published by Emil Kroymann at Vienna in 1906. I made a collation of this MS. in 1920, and can testify that of the scores, or perhaps hundreds, of readings cited as *Gel.*, hardly any are absent from this MS.

Gelenius being then an honest man, we can trust his statements about the MSS. of other authors.

A. SOUTER.

THE EXTENT OF TERRITORY BELONGING TO CITIES IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

IT is possible that the following passage has escaped the notice of many who take an interest in this topic. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, III. 15 (p. 119, ll. 6 ff., ed. Dombart[3]), states, on the authority of some ancient historian, that the Roman domain at the end of the regal period scarcely extended to twenty Roman miles from the city: 'uix illud imperium intra viginti ab Vrbe milia dilatauerint.' Then occur the important words: 'quantum spatium absit ut saltem alicuius Gaetulae ciuitatis nunc territorio comparetur!' This implies that cities in the Roman province Africa and in neighbouring provinces about A.D. 400 normally had territory extending far beyond twenty Roman miles from their walls.

The passage is not given in Dessau's article *Gaetuli* in Pauly-Wissowa, and in general it may be remarked that insufficient use has been made of evidence from Christian sources in that indispensable work.

A. SOUTER.

LUCRETIUS AND CICERO'S VERSE.

THESE remarks are intended as a reply to Merrill's paper of the same title in the *Univ. of California Publications in Class. Philology*, V. 9 (1921). Merrill's points are briefly these:

(1) 'The leading grammarians in the schools brought about a gradual change' in the Hexameter, so that the improvements common to Cicero and Lucretius are due to the influence of the schools, not to imitation of Cicero by L.

(2) Knowing Aratus in Greek, 'L. naturally used certain forms of expression in Latin that had been used by Cicero,' so that most of the parallels between Cicero and L. 'will prove to be mere coincidence.'

1. Assuming that there were any teachers at Rome before Valerius Cato who might be said to have started 'schools' of poetry, it still seems clear from the scanty remains of the poetry of the time, that what they taught would be precisely what was rejected by Lucretius and ridiculed by Cicero—the pretty, smooth, somewhat invertebrate Hexameter affected by the νεωτερίζοντες in their *epyllia*, and their neat manipulation of the Greek lyric metres, culminating in Galliambics, Technopaegnia, and the like: of serious didactic poetry, like that of Cicero and L., there is not a trace. For L., the

only model available was Cicero, particularly the *Aratea*.[1] Similarly, Cicero and L. stand almost, if not quite, alone in their admiration of Ennius. That they recognised the Ennian Hexameter did need improvement is shown by their practice; that they were on the whole right in clinging to the past while learning from the present is shown by the history of the Latin Hexameter, which gradually drops the mannerisms, preciosity, and prettinesses of the 'schools' and develops along the lines laid down by the catholic-minded Cicero and his great disciple, discarding their few remaining archaisms—which were mostly, no doubt, the result of still imperfect technique. The Hexameter of the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics* is far nearer to L. than to, *e.g.*, the *Peleus and Thetis*. When Cicero in a famous passage allows L. *ars* as well as *ingenium*, he is probably thinking of L.'s improvements on Ennian technique, agreeing as they did with his own practice.

2. That Aratus was enormously popular at Rome is clear; when Cicero's version was still without rivals it must have been widely read; a scientist like L., with a foible for astronomy, with dreams of himself writing a great didactic poem, can hardly have failed to read it; what more likely than that, having once read it, he would at once recognise that here was the very model he had looked for, uniting the dignity of the old with much of the elegance of the new? Had Cicero's work been technically far worse than it is, it still contained the key to the solution of L.'s problem—a problem which, as is clear from many passages in the poem, had greatly exercised and fascinated him. Cicero with his wonderful ear and sense of style had done for the Hexameter what L., with all his genius, might never have achieved. (Similarly, modern English prose style owes more to the somewhat bald prose of Tillotson and the Royal Society, than to the glowing periods of Browne, Taylor, Milton, etc., and modern sonata form to C. P. E. Bach, than to his far greater father.)

However, for verbal parallels, the evidence lies before us in Merrill's careful list. While conceding that many are of a kind that any writer of Hexameters might have hit on under similar circumstances, I cannot but think that there is a residue which cannot be explained except as deliberate imitations. The following (mostly from Merrill) seem the most decisive [of course some may go back to Ennius]:

	Lucretius.	*Cicero.*
1. 35	tereti cervice reposta.	t. c. reflexum.
68	minitanti murmure.	m. m.
2. 148	convestire luce.	convestit lumine.
321	omnia quae . . . confusa videntur.	o. q. c. v.
555	fluitantia aplustra.	f. a.
3. 218	toto iam corpore cessit.	t. cum c. cedit.
289	ex oculis micat ardor.	ardore micantes (*de Cons.*),
316	quorum ego nunc nequeo caecas expromere causas.	q. e. n. n. tortos evolvere cursus.
488	fulminis ictu | concidit.	f. i. c. (*de Cons.*)
4. 391	aetheriis adfixa cavernis.	a. inclusa c.
5. 261	quod superest . . . flumina fontes	q. s. flumine fontis.
[498	aether ignifer.	igniferum aethera.]
712	labitur ex alia signorum parte per orbem.	s. labier orbem.
1205	stellisque micantibus aethera *fixum* ('studded,' a fine phrase).	adfixa videtur | stella micans.

W. B. SEDGWICK.

[1] The shadowy Egnatius, whose *De Rerum Natura* in verse is twice quoted by Macrobius, though apparently older than Cicero and L. (like them he drops final 's'), seems never to have been much read. L.'s claims to originality (*Avia Pieridum*, etc.) show pretty conclusively that he had never read him, so that he falls outside our discussion.

REVIEWS

VIRGIL AND DR. MACKAIL.

Virgil and His Meaning to the World of To-day. By J. W. MACKAIL. One vol. 8vo. Pp. xix + 159. London: Harrap, 1923. 5s.

DR. MACKAIL has achieved the impossible task of writing about the best known of classical writers a book as fresh as if no one had written on Virgil before. Something is new, and those parts which have often been thought before have never been so well expressed. As delightful to read as a novel, it is a summary introduction to the poet for the general reader, who will find in it the indispensable facts about the poet's world, life, and works, with such appreciation and criticism as will stimulate as well as guide his judgment. We can think of no classical author, except Euripides, for whom this has been done before. Dr. Mackail's book renews a precedent and provides an example, which it is to be hoped will be followed with other

authors. It must be read to be appreciated, but we quote one or two specimens to show the kind of criticism in which it abounds. 'It was Virgil's aim, it is perhaps his greatest achievement, to fuse the new romantic sensibility with the epic largeness and the Roman dignity.' 'The so-called didactic poem was a courageous attempt to bring the whole field of the arts and sciences within the scope of imaginative treatment.' 'Lyrical instinct is so grounded in the English genius that it gives to the whole body of English poetry a quality of its own; the epic as such is to some degree foreign to the English mode of creation.' We wish we could add to these the brilliant summary of the chief motives of the *Aeneid* (p. 74 f.).

At times some of Dr. Mackail's readers may be unwilling to go the whole way with him; as when he ascribes to the Dido episode 'a greatness and intensity unsurpassed in ancient or modern poetry,' or when he praises Virgil's portraiture of boys. Iulus is indeed intended to supply a light and colour absent from the main figure (as the young Lord Castlewood is introduced into *Esmond*), but many readers find Iulus in effect if not in intention a wooden doll, and Virgil here far less successful than Thackeray. And should Virgil, on the strength of the tenth *Eclogue*, be described as the 'fountain-head of romanticism'? There is romanticism enough in the second idyll of Theocritus, or in the idyll on which Virgil modelled his *Eclogue;* and even if we ignore Apollonius Rhodius, and deny any claims on behalf of the lost Alexandrians, there is the *Attis* of Catullus. Still, romanticism covers a number of virtues—or sins—and we may be misinterpreting Dr. Mackail's use of the word.

With admirable justice Dr. Mackail writes: 'For the enormous and chaotic production of the present age, it is more than ever essential to have a standard of quality, to preserve and study and appreciate the masterpieces.' But is he right in adding, 'This standard Virgil gives more fully perhaps than any other single poet'? Not only may it be argued that in conception the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the last four books of the *Aeneid* are errors in literary tact, disguised by the amazing genius with which they were executed, and that Virgil's style is often, as some of his contemporaries found it, a *nova cacozelia*. A standard by which to judge literature must surely be more simple, spontaneous, and natural than Virgil, and the history of the Latin poetry of the empire—one of the great literary débâcles of the world—shows how little Virgil availed to train men who were brought up on his works. It is doubtful whether Latin literature can furnish such a standard. The earlier poets thought too little about the art of literature, and Virgil and his successors thought too much.

Similar doubts rise when Virgil is shown to us as a guide to world reconstruction. Ill-suited to such needs is the 'sadness at the doubtful doom of human kind,' the sense of *lacrimae rerum*, to which no poet has ever so perfectly given voice, and which betray an old world, half-consciously aware of its spiritual malaise. Nor should we forget that this shy and consumptive student preached the ideal of Prussianism in its noblest and most seductive form.

> Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,
> * * * * *
> Parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

This is very different from the ideal of empire which is one of the greatest creations of the British race.

On points such as these Dr. Mackail's book leaves room for doubts. What is undoubted is, that by showing the reader how to understand and enjoy the classics, it marks the best way of encouraging their study.

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

BAILEY'S *LUCRETIUS*.

Lucreti De Rerum Natura libri sex. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit CYRILLUS BAILEY. Editio altera. One vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 4s. net.

THE editor records in his preface that, during the twenty-three years that have passed since his first edition, the study of Lucretius has been much advanced by three contributions—the edition of Giussani, the facsimiles of the Leyden MSS. edited by M. Ém. Chatelain, and the critical studies of Professor W. A. Merrill. Giussani's services were great indeed, but are valuable chiefly for the interpretation of the poem. And the facsimiles, beautiful as they are, have not told us much of importance that we did not know before; the prefaces of Chatelain have indeed laid down a new date for Q, and a different archetype for all the MSS.; but of all this Mr. Bailey says nothing. Of Professor Merrill's success as an emender of the text Mr. Bailey expresses a high opinion, but seldom, if ever, promotes his emendations to the text.

Though the pagination appears to correspond exactly to that of the first edition, yet the *apparatus criticus* is much fuller than it was: many additional readings of O and Q are given, and the number of conjectures recorded is much larger. It might have been well, in an edition of this kind, to add the *tituli* from O, which are of some importance in the criticism of Lucretius: they are duly recorded by M. Ernout in the *apparatus* to his text (Paris, 1920). M. Ernout's record of readings too seems somewhat fuller; thus he gives O's *de coetum materia* (i. 1017), which throws some light on O's *teneri res in concilium medii* (i. 1082) where Marullus substituted *concilio*.

The editor reports in his preface that he has made 171 changes in the text of his new edition, and that in 108 of these he has restored the reading of the Leyden MSS. Some at least of these restorations—*e.g.*, *permaneant* for *permanent* (i. 122), and *nox* for *sol* (v. 1189), are unquestionably right. But he still gives in many places more credit to the tradition than it deserves. Thus he retains the solecism of *omnia . . . crescentes* (i. 190), which Munro got rid of by supposing that a line is lost; he does not object to the bad logic of i. 334,

> quapropter locus est intactus inane uacansque

before any proof has been given that Void exists; and he tolerates the unexampled dative in *-āī* of i. 453.

The existence of *lacunae* is admitted in six passages of the First Book, but not after l. 1114; yet that passage has never been explained except on Munro's hypothesis of a missing line. Transposition of single lines is admitted to be a fairly common error in the text; but the editor wisely refrains from following Giussani, who too often transposed whole paragraphs. There is a passage in the First Book (ll. 998-1001) where the editor adopts Munro's transposition; but, if transposition is needed (and I think it is), it is certain that the place chosen by Giussani for these four lines is a better place for them than that chosen by Munro. Indeed, Giussani's explanation of the whole passage is one of his palmary achievements. His transposition, recorded (though not accepted) by Ernout, is not even mentioned in this edition. The editor reprints his own conjecture of *intust* for *intus* (iv. 961), without offering any justification of such a novelty.

On the whole, this text is the best and most convenient for an English reader to study Lucretius in. If I were a Frenchman, I should give the preference to M. Ernout's, which is a more business-like book, with its pages duly numbered and its date printed on its first page. This book, like the rest of the series, has no date and no pagination. The preface is dated 1921, but this does not fix the year of publication. One would like to know, for instance, whether the editor takes account of M. Ernout's text; he does not appear anywhere to refer to it.

J. D. DUFF.

DUFF'S *LUCRETIUS* I.

T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Liber Primus. Edited, with introduction, notes, and index, by J. D. DUFF, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. One vol. Pp. xxvi + 136. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1923. 4s.

AFTER a long interval Mr. Duff has edited another book of Lucretius for us, and all students of the poet will be grateful for it. It is brief—almost tantalisingly brief—but full of ripe scholarship and considered opinions, fresh, too, both in its many original views and in its general treatment. An introduction of eighteen pages deals with Lucretius' life; with the poem in general; with the Leyden MSS.; and with two editors, to whom Mr. Duff acknowledges a special debt—Bernays and Giussani. In each of these sections there is a concise statement of what can be certainly known and a studied avoidance of all that is doubtful. It is interesting to note that Mr. Duff (p. xi) holds that Cicero in his famous criticism attributed both *ingenium* and *ars* to the poem, and meant that 'it displays not only the native genius of the early Roman poets, but also that art of finished execution which our modern poets have imitated from the Alexandrians.' In this I most fully agree, and am glad to see it stated dogmatically. It is interesting, too, that he has adopted (p. xvi) Giussani's notion of passages written later by the poet when he was engaged on subsequent books: of this notion Mr. Duff in his notes makes sparing but effective use.

Mr. Duff is of course an ardent disciple of Munro, and thinks that 'the text of the poem remains substantially as he left it' (p. i). His edition naturally enough takes for granted an acquaintance with Munro's text and notes; but since it is presumably intended to stand by itself, is it not a little misleading to make no mention of any MS. besides O and Q, or, again, of editors since Munro? Mr. Duff cites Brieger occasionally and the recent text of Ernout: is it reasonable to ignore the work of Merrill? I should not expect Mr. Duff to agree with Merrill's views as to the text; but in his two editions and innumerable papers he has done so much to forward the study of Lucretius that one would have expected to find some reference to him. One more small point in the introduction: is it fair (p. xv) to speak of 'Logic, or, as Epicurus preferred to call it, Canonic'? Epicurus despised logic, and regarded his own Canonice as a code of practical procedure.

The text in the main follows Munro, and in certain places (188-9, 599-600, 1068-1075) prints in italics Munro's brilliant supplements in suspected lacunae. The critical notes are few, and I cannot detect on what principle they are inserted; for they are sometimes given in what seem comparatively unimportant places (*e.g.* 207, 520, 542, 666), and omitted elsewhere where they would seem to be required in order to form an adequate judgment on the text (*e.g.* 784-5, where *ignem . . . igni* of OQ can hardly be ignored). To one who believes in a return to the text of OQ, at least as a foundation, Mr. Duff's text seems rather disappointingly to follow the tradition of the nineteenth-century editors; but that is a matter of personal prejudice. In particular I deprecate the practice of disparaging the text of OQ by destroying the parallels which it offers: *e.g.* in 188-190 'omnia quando paulatim crescunt, ut par est, semine certo, crescentesque genus seruant,' Mr. Duff inserts Munro's supplement in his text, and says in the note that 'editors who deny a lacuna have to account for the solecism of *crescentes* agreeing with *omnia:* no similar instance, without metrical necessity, can be produced from the poem.' Not if you 'emend' the parallels, such as *horum* in 450. But in 57 Mr. Duff himself admits that *perempta* refers to the *res* of the previous line; and in III. 185 he left *res ulla . . . quorum*, which is the exact parallel of I. 450. I don't say that these instances prove the more difficult text in 188-190, but they do, I think, show a tendency in Lucretius to assimilate *res* and the neuter, and make it unreasonable to say that 'no similar instance can be produced.' Mr. Duff's own contributions to the text are *sunt* for *sint* in 319,

which seems hardly necessary; and the transposition of lines 658, 659, which with Munro's *nasci* in 657 makes a very plausible restoration of a difficult passage.

The notes are full of good and interesting comments, and Mr. Duff finds room for modern (and often humorous) illustrations. One would like to quote, but I can only refer to the notes on 20, 43, 85, 115, 150, 164, 173, 303, 329, 370, 435, 642, 881, 1035, as particularly illuminating. It is surprising how much has been crowded into a small space, and Mr. Duff has done special service in his elucidations and criticisms of Lucretius' argument. I do not, however, find his exposition of the argument in 958-1013 convincing. Mr. Duff regards the whole of this passage as proving the infinity of the universe, the separate proofs of the infinity of body and void being apparently contained in the lacuna following 1014. To support this view Mr. Duff is compelled to include (p. 121) among the 'many names' which Lucretius uses for the universe both *omne quod est spatium* (969), *spatium summai totius omne* (984), and *rerum summa* (1008). This is surely very unnatural: the first two of these expressions should mean 'the totality of space,' and *rerum summa* 'the sum-total of matter.' And so they do, if we divide the passage thus: (1) 958-983 (? +998-1001) the infinity of the universe; (2) 984-1007 the infinity of space; (3) 1008-1051 the infinity of body. One wishes Mr. Duff could have argued at greater length for a view which at first sight seems unnatural and confusing.

The reader will certainly wish that Mr. Duff had not thought it necessary, as he states in the preface, to 'restrict illustration, even from the other books of Lucretius, within narrow limits.' Lucretius is so frequently his own best commentator, and a few parallels or even references would often have been of value—*e.g.* in the notes on 58, 82, and 86; or again his view that the invocation to Venus is traditional mythology might have been greatly strengthened in five words by a reference to the parallel invocation to *callida musa Calliope* in VI. 94. In 469 I agree that the OQ text *terris . . . regionibus* must be kept, but not with Mr. Duff's explanation: the two words correspond to 'body and space,' as shown by *materies rerum . . . locus ac spatium* (471, 2) and *corporis atque loci* (482); 'space' like 'body' may have its *euenta* as well as its *coniuncta*. Again in 744 OQ's *solem* may surely be kept in the sense of 'sunlight,' which it has *e.g.* in V. 1192; nor in 175 can I believe that *uites* is a natural 'gloss' on *uuas*.

If I have selected a few places where I cannot agree with Mr. Duff—as a critic is bound to—I should like to conclude by saying that there are many (*e.g.* 122, 435, 566, 885-7) where I am delighted to find views I have long held confirmed by Mr. Duff's authority. In many other passages he has made suggestions which convince at first sight, or at least give food for reflection. It is not often that so brief an edition contains so much valuable material.

C. BAILEY.

HOSIUS' *PROPERTIUS*, ED. 2.

Sex. Propertii Elegiarum libri IV iterum edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. One vol. Pp. xxii + 190. Fcap. 8vo. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922. 3.40 sh.

THIS edition follows the first at an interval of eleven years. In the apparatus criticus Mr Hosius has made some 70 or 80 changes, attended by misprints at I 1 30, II 32 23, and III 22 9. Some of the additions are details derived from a fresh examination of N and A, but others were already to be found in Baehrens and might have been given in the 1st ed. if they were to be given at all. Most of them are quite useless and so trivial as to be out of place in an apparatus which does not pretend to furnish full collations; it is however worth knowing that AFDV all four of them have *quantus* I 14 6 and *sunt* ib. 16, that A, and perhaps N, has *uota* I 16 2, and that in II 1 47 the first reading of A was *uni*, which is the conjecture of Bosscha. The new pro-

posals recorded are about 25, which is far too many. The apparatus of the 1st ed. was already full enough of rubbish: at I 3 20 three conjectures, *ignotae, in notis, in natis*, all intolerable and all arising from simple ignorance, which Mr Hosius must be deemed to share, of what *ignotis* means. He still does not distinguish sensible suggestions from foolish ones, nor cite those in preference to these. If any substitute for *creditur* IV 8 10 was to be mentioned, it should have been Mr Birt's *conditur*, not Cornelissen's *raditur*.

In the attribution of conjectures to their authors Mr Hosius' Propertius is less untrustworthy than his Lucan, but the following corrections are required. I 16 38 *tanta* not Hailer but Vat. 5. I 19 19 *mixta* not Otto but Baehrens (*cum mixta mea possim*). II 1 37: Vulpius placed no lacuna before this verse. II 2 11 *et* not Butler but Scaliger. II 6 35 sq. before 27 not Heydenreich but Kuinoel. II 8 8 *sic in* not Rasi but Palmer (1874, Ouid. *her.* p. xxxvi). II 12 6 *haud uano* not Housman but Nodell. II 16 23 *cubares* not Palmer but codd. recc. II 19 5 *ulla* not Guyet but Commelini liber. II 20 8 *in* not Enk but Vat. 5. II 28 62 dist. not Gebhardus but Gebhardi codd. II 34 31 *Musis meliorem* not Fuerstenau but Scaliger. II 34 83 *hic* not Lachmann but the printer of his 2nd ed. III 5 6 *misera* not Broukhusius but Acidalius (at Vell. Pat. I 14). III 6 29 *tacentia* not Palmer but Palmerius. III 15 31 *componunt* not Marx but Doruilii cod. 2. III 18 21 *manet* not Palmer but Keil. IV 3 11 *gaudia* and *noctis* not Rothstein and Bury but L. Mueller. IV 3 55 *Craugidos* not Buecheler but Bergk.[1] IV 7 27 *furuum* not Heinsius but Passerat. IV 11 97 *sumpta* not Havet but Baehrens (with *matri*). Conjectures of my own attributed to others I do not reclaim.

Mr Hosius says that he has made few changes in the text, and apart from the correction of misprints in II 1 68, 24 24, and 26 35, I have noticed only three: I 16 2 *uota* for *nota*, II 28 56 *omnes* for *omnis*, and IV 1 71 *fata* for *facta*. The medieval orthography of the MSS, *humor, humidus, iocundus, soboles, nequicquam* II 4 5 (though N has the true form, which is printed in III 17 23), *Alcidem, Cybellem, Aganippeae, Ephyreae*, is still ascribed to Propertius; and so are other false spellings which have been imported by conjecture: *siccine* III 6 9, *Theiodamanteo* I 20 6, *Perimedeae* II 4 8, *Philitaeis* IV 6 3 (but *Philitea* correctly III 3 52). The hexameter II 34 39 *Amphiareae non prosint tibi fata quadrigae* still bears its witness to Mr Hosius' knowledge of metre. So correct and normal does it appear to him that he makes no remark upon it in his *index metricus et prosodiacus*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

[1] I have said this before, and as scholars educated at Bonn are loth to believe it I now give chapter and verse. Buecheler proposed *Craugidos* in 1888 (*Rhein. Mus.* XLIII p. 297): Bergk had already proposed it, not for the first time, in 1873 (*Augusti rer. a se gest. ind.* p. 124).

JULIANUS REDIVIVUS.

Imp. Caesaris Flavii Claudii Iuliani Epistulae Leges Poematia Fragmenta Varia. Collegerunt recensuerunt I. BIDEZ et F. CUMONT. Pp. xxvi + 328. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres'; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press, 1922. (Paper, 11s. net; cloth, 12s. 6d. net.)

JULIAN, correspondent and lawgiver, is indeed *felix opportunitate resurrectionis*. For resurrection it is when a personality, who has lain buried for fifty years in the editions of Hercher and Hertlein, is restored to us as Julian is restored in this edition. And the collaboration of a skilled textual critic like the editor of Philostorgius with the chief living authority on the religious antiquities of the fourth century, essential as it was to the production of a definitive edition of Julian's correspondence, was almost too opportune to hope for. Students of the *Götterdämmerung* were already familiar, if not with the text of the

Recherches published by MM. Bidez and Cumont in 1898, at least with the deep impress their conclusions had made on Allard's three-volume work on Julian. And now, at last, these *Recherches* have borne their appropriate fruit in the edition before us.

The traditional collection of Julian's letters, as has long been recognised, includes several false attributions and forgeries. Here, for the first time, the sheep are formally separated from the goats, and the 'spuriae uel dubiae' are put in their proper place at the end of the book. Next, the genuine letters, so far as internal evidence or general historical probability renders such attribution possible, are arranged chronologically as Gaulish, Illyrian, Constantinopolitan, Anatolian, Antiochene. With those which can be thus assigned go others which appear to reflect the same conditions, or bear them a general similarity; such attribution cannot, of course, be final. There remain six letters (out of eighty-five) franked 'temporis incerti.' The six Papadopoulos letters appear for the first time in an edition of Julian's Epistles. The MS. tradition has been reviewed, and practically all the MSS. collated; and the text has been substantially improved. Only about half a dozen *cruces* remain to disfigure the text of the genuine letters.

Had this been all we should have had reason for gratitude. But the editors have gone further, and have not only printed the laws of Julian (to whom, with Dessau, they assign the Fayûm papyrus *de auro coronario*) with *apparatus criticus*, and distributed in their chronological sequence in relation to the letters, but have collected every statement in contemporary and later writers bearing on Julian as correspondent or lawgiver. Even two inscriptions find a place in this catalogue. There are *Indices fontium et nominum*.

The net result is a source-book indispensable to all students both of Roman and of Early Christian history. To praise such a book, nobly planned and finely executed, is superfluous. A more becoming tribute to the editors is to make immediate use of their *apparatus criticus* in an assault on their *loci desperati*. The passages are quoted according to their new pagination.

P. 15 f.:

ὁ μὲν γὰρ Τύριος Μάξιμος εἰς βιβλία [μὲν] πλείονα τῆς λογικῆς† ὀλίγα δυεῖν εἶπε†, σὺ δέ με δι' ἑνὸς βιβλίου τῆς Ἀριστοτελικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐποίησας ἴσως δὴ καὶ βάκχον, ἀλλ' οὔ τι ναρθηκοφόρον.

Read *ὀλίγου δεῖν οὐδὲν εἶπε* ('said next to nothing by way of comment on several books of the *Logic*'). Mr. Harrison suggests *ἀλλ' οὖν ναρθηκοφόρον*.

P. 19:

ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν αἰσχρὸν εἶναι δοκεῖ τοὺς μὲν χιλιάρχους, ὅταν λείπωσι τὴν τάξιν, καταδικάζειν (καίτοι† χρῆν ἱκανὰ† τεθνάναι παραχρῆμα καὶ μηδὲ ταφῆς ἀξιοῦσθαι) τὴν δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀθλίων ἀνθρώπων ἀπολείπειν τάξιν. . . .

'*χρῆν ἐκείνους* Boissonade, *χρὴ νικᾶν ἢ* P. Thomas.' But surely this parenthesis refers, not to the cowardly officer, but to the indulgent judge. Read *χρῆν οἰκτίσαντα τεθνάναι*.

P. 31:

A parenthesis (*καὶ τοῦτο† αὐτοῖς εἰ† καταφανὲς ὂν ἐνεδέχετο τρόπον ἐποίησα*).

αὐτοῖς εἶναι seems too obvious to have been overlooked. What is wrong with it?

P. 68:

Julian reprimands the Alexandrines for the murder of Bishop Georgius: *τολμᾷ δῆμος ὥσπερ οἱ κύνες ἄνθρωπον σπαράττειν, εἶτα οὐκ αἰσχύνεται καὶ† φυλάττει καθαρὰς τας χεῖρας ὡς προσάγειν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς αἵματος καθαρευούσας.*

The *crux* is correctly inserted. What Julian wrote was: *εἶτα οὐκ αἰσχύνεται κατὰ φυλὰς ὕδατι καθάρας τὰς χεῖρας προσάγειν πρὸς τ. θ. ὡς αἵματος καθαρευούσας.* For *καθάρας* is the form of the aorist affected by Julian; *cf.* *ἀποκαθᾶραι* below, and p. 135, ll. 27, 28. *κατὰ φυλάς* implies that the reference is to the *χέρνιβες* before the tribal sacrifice; such an occasion suits the context. ΚΑΤΑΦΤΛΑΣΤΔΑΤΙ became ΚΑΙΦΤΛΑΤΤΕΙ (by way of ΚΑΤΑΦΤΛΑΤΙ); *καθάρας* was read as *καθαρὰς*; and *ὡς* was transferred to make a construction which appears to have satisfied Lang.

P. 126:

τοὺς μὲν . . . . . ων . . . . ειας σχολῇ προσέχοντας.

'Ἑβραίων *ἀσεβείας* exactly fits the gaps in V, and is closer to what Dübner thought he saw through his acid than any other proposal. Whether the desiderated *τῇ τῶν* before 'Ἑβραίων was omitted by Julian himself or by a copyist I do not seek to determine.

P. 142:

Read *ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐχ ἱερεὺς <ἔστ>ιν ἁπλῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἱερεῖ προσήκει μόνον ὃ δὴ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς λειτουργίας ἐπιτηδεύ<ει, χρὴ σκοπεῖν τί μὲν ὡς ἱερεῖ προστακ>τέον, τί δὲ ὡς ἱερατεύειν ἀνθρώπῳ λαχόντι συγχωρητέον, ὅταν ἐκτὸς ᾖ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς λειτουργίας.* That, at any rate, is what Julian proceeds to consider.

This last passage is *not* marked as *desperatus* by B. and C. There remain *cruces* on pp. 12 (where Platt's *ἅλις* should have been adopted), 96, 158.

W. M. CALDER.

HALLIDAY'S *ROMAN RELIGION*.

Lectures on the History of Roman Religion from Numa to Augustus. By W. R. HALLIDAY. Pp. 178 + 4 index. Liverpool: The University Press of Liverpool, Ltd.; London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd, 1922. 5s.

THE study of the religion of Ancient Rome has been practically revolutionised in the last generation mainly by the work of two men, Wissowa and Warde Fowler; yet there has hitherto been no short popular presentation of the results accessible to the general English reader. Professor Halliday has admirably supplied the want. In eight lectures he has given a clear picture of the 'Religion of Numa,' and traced its development through the periods of Italian expansion, of Greek influence, of philosophy and of the revival of Augustus with its beginnings of emperor worship. The book is no mere compilation; it is fresh and vital throughout, he keeps religion always in touch with the general political history of Rome, and his line of approach is often original. One might mention in particular the whole chapter on 'The Religion of the State,' where he brings out very happily what the transition from an agricultural worship to a state-cult meant and the organisation it involved, the opening of Lecture VI. where a brief page gives a clear idea of the changes which had come in by the time of the Punic wars, and a very penetrating analysis on p. 87 of the three main classes of deities found in the oldest stratum. But there are good things like this all through the book, which to anyone coming new to the subject should be little short of fascinating.

The reviewer of a short summary of a large subject generally finds something to complain of as regards omissions and on the ground of dogmatism. On the first head I have little to say, though I think that a second edition might contain a few extra pages in Lecture II. on the ritual of the household worship, about which Dei Marchi (*Il Culto Privato di Roma Antica*) has collected a good deal of information. On a smaller point, Professor Halliday on p. 51 rejects the human sacrifice view of the Argei, but proposes no alternative: might not fertility-magic be suggested as a possibility — the *Golden Bough* supplies a good many parallels? Under the second head, it is always very difficult to be brief without being dogmatic, but perhaps it is unsafe to state without any suggestion of doubt—*e.g.* that the symbol ℕ stands for *nefastus* (p. 44), that the goats at the Lupercalia were sacrificed to Faunus (p. 59) (Faunus = Pan, Lupercalia = Lycaea, and there is the Evander legend in the background), or that Iupiter Feretrius is the god of the thunderbolt (p. 100). More serious perhaps is the statement on p. 125 that 'the completely anthropomorphic character of the ideas expressed in presenting a banquet to divine beings is absolutely foreign to the numinism of early Rome'; here you have to reckon with the *epulum Iovis* and the household offering at the daily meal; Warde Fowler (*R.E.* p. 173) is much more cautious. Or, again, is it true (p. 149) that 'the influence of the comic stage upon the Roman lower classes was not less potent than the influence of Greek philosophy upon the upper'? Do we know much about the influence of comedy on the lower classes, and is there much profanity in Plautus and Terence? The *Amphitryon*, which Professor Halliday quotes, is surely unique.

One or two more criticisms suggest themselves at different points in the book. On p. 39 Professor Halliday writes, 'The collective, ancestral dead, Di Manes': Manes, perhaps, but it is at least doubtful whether the Di Manes were not in the earliest period the underworld gods, of whom we have traces in such persons as Vediovis and Acca Larentia. On p. 70 Quirinus is described as 'a form of Mars'; this is surely misleading. Quirinus was an independent personality, though he doubtless occupied in the Quirinal settlement the same position as Mars did on the Palatine. On p. 79 the derivation of *augur* from *auis* is given without an alternative: is not recent

opinion veering to the alternative connexion with the root of *augere*, seen again in *augustus?* The *augur* may well be the 'blesser' rather than the 'bird-man.' On p. 155 I think Epicurean scepticism about the existence and nature of the gods is put too strongly. In the last chapter on the Augustan revival, which is admirably done, I do not think it is sufficiently brought out that the inclusion of Apollo on the Palatine and in the Augustan forum was intended to link up the Graeco-Roman cult with the old Roman religion, represented by Vesta and Mars, both in close relation to the emperor himself.

These are all comparatively small points, which Professor Halliday may like to think over before a second edition is due, as I hope it will be very soon. There is no doubt that the book as a whole is a great help to the understanding of Roman life and thought and should do much to remove the impression that Roman religion was mere 'dry bones.' Professor Halliday first became known to students of classical religion by his excellent essay on *Greek Divination:* may we hope that he will give us the book that has long been wanted on the difficult problem of Roman divination?

C. BAILEY.

POSTGATE'S *PROSODIA LATINA*.

Prosodia Latina. By J. P. POSTGATE, F.B.A. One vol. 8vo. Pp. 120+8. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923. 4s. 6d. net.

THIS excellent manual of Latin prosody supplies a long-felt need. It is based on expert knowledge of the structure of Latin verse of the classical period and scientific understanding of the sounds of Latin speech; it is therefore sure to do good service in dispelling the mist of error that hangs about terms like 'long by nature,' 'long by position,' and many other confused notions that infest the study of classical verse. 'For the first time the reader and composer of Latin verse are pointed to the realities of Latin speech, and protected by a special mark from the vulgar confusion of the quantity of a vowel and the quantity of a syllable' (Preface, p. iii). Another salutary feature of the book is that it leaves severely alone the bewildering maze of speculation in which the enquirer finds himself involved when he enters the field of advanced metrical theory. Professor Postgate's treatment of the Latin metres is concrete and intelligible.

In the following remarks I call attention to some of the salient features of the book, and at the same time offer a few suggestions which the author may perhaps deem worthy of consideration in a future edition. I am gratified that he has adopted my terms 'rise' and 'fall' in place of the terms 'thesis' and 'arsis' (or 'arsis' and 'thesis'); § 177. Whether it is desirable to put any mark on the rise (§ 178) I doubt; at any rate, I think it would be better to reserve the accent-mark to indicate word-accents and sense-stresses. It is probably only by an oversight that Professor Postgate speaks of the rise being 'on' the long syllable (§ 179), and 'on' the first of the two short syllables (§ 180, § 243): in a future edition I hope he will write 'the rise will be the long syllable' in § 179, and 'the rise consists of the two short syllables' in § 180.

The cardinal doctrine of the book is the doctrine of syllables and their quantities. I cordially approve of the caution of the statement, 'It is customary to assume that a long quantity (syllable?) takes double the time of a short quantity (syllable?), so that ∪∪ = –. These two assumptions are convenient but not strictly correct' (§§ 35, 36). Some of the later sections (*e.g.* § 176) might, then, be more explicitly guarded.

Professor Postgate bases his rules of quantity on syllable-division, which is undoubtedly the only right way of making quantities intelligible and not a mere matter of arbitrary rule or convention. It also simplifies the doctrine of quantity, provided that we can arrive at a correct rule of syllable-division. A difficulty, however, arises at one

point. 'A closed syllable (*i.e.*, a syllable that ends in and includes one or more than one consonant) is long' (§ 23). Thus the syllable *-mat* in *amat* is declared to be long, the *t* adding a second unit of time to the unit contained in the short *a* (§ 40); but in a sequence of words like *amat equos* the *t* is transferred by liaison to the following syllable, and what is left is the short syllable *-ma*: '*-mat* is a syllable only before a following consonant or at the end of a sentence or verse' (§§ 46, 47). But how, then, are we to scan *Dixerat. Ille patris magni parere parabat | Imperio* (*Aen.* iv. 238; *cf.* 161, 522, 641, etc.), or *Dixit: at illa furens, acrique accensa dolore* (*Aen.* xi. 709)? According to Professor Postgate's rule *dixerat* is here a cretic word (–∪–) and *dixit* a spondee; for the pause at the end of the first sentence makes it impossible to pronounce *Dixera-Tille* or *Dixi-tat.* No explanation is offered of such cases, which are by no means uncommon. No doubt Professor Postgate has some explanation of them in his mind; but he ought to have told his readers what it is. The difficulty does not arise under the old rule that a syllable containing a short vowel and a single consonant is short. My own experiments in syllable-measurement by means of the mechanism called the kymograph lead me to think that Sievers' statement in his *Grundzüge der Phonetik* that all closed syllables are long is an exaggeration of the phonetic facts. Another difficulty which arises under Professor Postgate's rule of liaison (§§ 43 ff.) is the length of a syllable ending in a mute and followed by a word beginning with a liquid, *e.g. at res.* Here 'no transference was allowed' (§ 48). But why not? In *pa-tres* the transference was the usual practice (§ 27). The obvious reason is that here there was no liaison: so that it is not quite true to say, as Professor Postgate does (§ 25), that Roman speakers ended syllables with vowels *wherever they could: a tres* is by no means unpronounceable. And I feel sure that the Romans did not make *tibin' umquam* sound exactly like *tibi numquam.*

A small point arises in connexion with the marking of quantities. It has long seemed to me the simplest method to mark only the long vowels, and to treat the absence of any mark over a vowel as an indication of its shortness. The quantity of *syllables* might be indicated by the sign of syllable-division wherever so-called 'length by position' occurs within a word. Thus in § 114 Catullus 65. 22 might be written

| d(um) ad-ven-|tū mā|tris ‖ prōsilit,|
ex-cuti|tur.|

Other points that I should like to see reconsidered in a future edition are (1) whether it is really true that initial consonants are 'too short to affect the quantity of a syllable,' § 37; (2) whether the pyrrhic ought to be treated as a foot, § 175; (3) whether it would not be helpful to the pupil and scientifically sound to bring in accent as an explanation of the legitimate hexameter endings, § 213; (4) whether any purpose is served by side-thrusts at English verse, *e.g.* § 323, p. 114. I see nothing 'ignoble' in the metre called the English sapphic, as used by F. W. H. Myers in his 'St. Paul,' or by Philip Pusey in his hymn beginning, 'Lord of our life and God of our salvation.' Nor do I agree that the five-foot lines quoted in § 10 are of 'the same kind.' The one is refined English verse, the other (though written by Shakespeare) is not. The statement in § 11 as to the effect of the English accent on quantity is misleading, and might have been omitted altogether with advantage.

E. A. SONNENSCHEIN.

ERASMUS.

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami, denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. ALLEN *et* H. M. ALLEN. Vol. IV. Pp. xxxii + 632, with three plates. Oxonii: In Typographeo Clarendoniano, MCMXXII. 28s. net.

THE third volume of Mr. and Mrs. Allen's work came out in 1913. After an interval of nine years we welcome the appearance of the fourth volume (shortly to be followed by a fifth) containing 259 letters, 212 from and 47 to

Erasmus, seven being printed for the first time, and covering the period July 1, 1519 to December 30, 1521. The volume is embellished by a reproduction of Quentin Matsys' medallion of Erasmus (1519), which shows well the delicate mouth and soft look of the eyes, by a drawing of Dürer (1520), and by a miniature with a kneeling figure of Colet, taken from a MS. of Erasmus' translation of St. Matthew. Erasmus' Latinity is as usual far above that of his correspondents, the only one of whom who approaches him at all being Germain Brie. But much of the volume is very dreary reading. It opens with the unprofitable controversy with Edward Lee, which shows Erasmus at his worst, touchy and vindictive. As a set-off may be mentioned his success in stifling the controversy between Brie and More, the latter of whom shows himself in letter 1,087 unusually irritable. He is often taking up the cudgels in defence of the professors of Busleiden's *Trilingue Collegium* at Louvain, and much of the volume is occupied by the interminable controversy with Louvain theologians, who were embittered by the writings of Luther and the suspicion that 'Erasmus had stitched the shoe and Luther put it on,' and by its repercussions at Rome, in Germany, and in England. At the end Erasmus has taken refuge at Basle from the worries of Louvain. There is some interesting correspondence with Bohemia, with the elder Turzo, Bishop of Breslau, and the younger, Bishop of Olmütz. Letter 1,111 to the Spanish scholar Vives, with its survey of the state of University teaching in Europe, contains the surprising exaggeration: 'In Germania tot fere sunt Academiae quot oppida.' Letter 1,033 to Albert of Brandenburg, which was in print (whether by Erasmus' fault or not, who shall say?) before he received it, letters 1,007 and 1,143 to Leo X. and the Pope's answer, 1,180, have considerable interest. But it is fair to say that Erasmus' correspondence with and about English friends is the most important part of the volume. There are thirty-four letters, including five to and four from More, four to Pace, three apiece to Wolsey, Fisher, and Lupset, two to Warham, and one apiece to Henry VIII., Mountjoy, Foxe, Tunstall, Linacre, Guildford, Dancaster, and Lee: the latter replies with two letters written in good Latin style. Letter 999 is the well-known sketch of More, addressed to Hutten, and according to Mr. Allen 1519 is the correct date, not 1517, as Mr. Nichols thought. Mr. Allen is probably right in thinking that More at first wore a 'barba rarior,' but after 1520 was clean-shaven, as all extant likenesses represent him. The beard, which had committed no treason, was doubtless grown in prison. The contrast of Fulvius and Rutuba with Apelles, occurring also in the preface to Jerome, vol. II., certainly suggests that Erasmus regarded them as inferior painters. In l. 252 Mr. Allen reads, 'et in his, materiis adoxis, quod in his . . .' This seems clumsy for Erasmus, who seldom writes so carelessly. Should the first 'in his' be omitted?

On September 16, 1519, Colet died, to the genuine grief of Erasmus, who writes sadly to Fisher: 'Erasmum etiam magis amplectere, quod Coletus auulsus dimidiatum reliquit.' On October 16 he begs Lupset to supply materials for a memoir. But Lupset, perhaps owing to ill-health, did not respond, and so out of his personal knowledge he addressed a biographical sketch of Colet on June 13, 1521, to Jodocus Jonas of Erfurt (1211), and, writing to Lupset on August 23, he says it is his fault if the portrait is unfaithful. Its contents are well known, the late Dr. Lupton having translated it with a commentary in 1883. It is to be assigned to 1521, not 1519. In l. 273 'nulli erat iniquior quam Augustino,' the statement is both surprising and, as Dr. Lupton showed, incorrect in fact. The form of the sentence suggests that Erasmus meant the opposite, that Augustine was the father in whom Colet took most delight; and it is not to the point that Erasmus was once himself accused of being 'iniquior Augustino.' Either he is unusually careless here, or the text is incorrect. It is difficult to suppose that the name Pullus given to Colet in the *Colloquia* is a bad pun (colt—Colet): why not the 'dark-robed one'? If in l. 355 'solarium' is the

right word, the variant 'coenaculum' shows the meaning to have been that St. Paul's School had no separate apartments for dining or sleeping. Whether Fitzjames was as conservative a theologian as Erasmus represents him (l. 530), the librarian of Merton, who has charge of Fitzjames' copy of Origen's *Homilies*, rightly doubts. It has been a puzzle why Colet so severely condemned the 'Collegia' (l. 484), as he could hardly have disapproved of the newer foundations at Cambridge and Oxford. Mr. Allen makes the attractive suggestion that it was the Colleges of Canons that were 'inuitabula ociosorum.' In favour of this is the form of the sentence: 'he disapproved of the Collegia, nor did he think as much as might have been expected ('perinde') of University courses of lectures.' As in the letter of August 1516 to Bullock (*Ep.* 456, 228-37), so in *Ep.* 1,111 he speaks highly of the theological course at Cambridge, and in *Ep.* 1,238 brackets Cambridge with Paris. Of Oxford it is only said that monastic influence had created opposition, but had been repressed by Wolsey and the King, an echo of the Greek and Trojan controversy.

We congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Allen on having made such progress with this truly monumental work, and hope they will be able to see a successful termination of their devoted labours. In no learned journal is it more appropriate that their work should receive due recognition than in the *Classical Review*.

G. C. RICHARDS.

THE MAKING OF LATIN.

The Making of Latin. An Introduction to Latin, Greek, and English Etymology. By R. S. CONWAY, F.B.A. Pp. viii + 146. London: John Murray. 5s. net.

PROFESSOR CONWAY'S aim in this little book is 'to explain the principles of the modern science of language and to indicate the chief result of these principles in the study of Latin, with some of the consequences in that of English and the Romance languages.' He has specially in view the needs of the schoolboy or schoolgirl of a classical sixth form.

The first three chapters are introductory. Chapter I. gives a brief sketch of the Indo-European group of languages, and a simple account of Phonetic Law and Analogy. Chapter II. deals with Phonetics. This is the chapter which beginners will doubtless find hardest, and which will require most explanation and addition by the teacher. It would have been improved by a fuller treatment of breath and voice, with some practical hints for distinguishing voiced and breathed sounds. Room might have been found by the omission of § 38 (Palatal Fricatives). A comparison of p. 11 with p. 20 might lead the reader to suppose (1) that *wh* is pronounced fully and truly by the educated class in Edinburgh only, and (2) that the pronunciation *w* is a vulgarism. In Chapter III. the subjects discussed are Proethnic Indo-European, Grimm's and Verner's Laws, Accent and Ablaut. One cannot help thinking that the account of the first sound-shift would have been clearer to a schoolboy, if it had been done in the usual way by giving Grimm's Law first and then stating Verner's modification, and more easily remembered if more use had been made of the numerals (*e.g.*, *duō*, *trēs*, *decem*) as illustrations. Schoolboys and older people remember these laws by thinking of examples, and for this reason illustrations should be selected not merely for their interest (as *dūcō* = *teach*) but for the ease with which they may be recalled, and the hint that examples should be sought among nouns of relationship and numerals (with a warning to Latin students against using 'four' and 'five') I have found in a long teaching experience to be most serviceable and welcome to students.

Chapter IV. deals with the Sounds and Accent of Cicero's Latin, and Chapter V. with the Earlier Behaviour of the Latin Accent. The scheme of

Latin pronunciation is taken from the table issued by the authority of the Classical Association. It is late in the day to criticise this, but in a philology primer a loose expression like 'Isaiah (*broadly* pronounced)' should disappear, and 'plosives' should replace 'hard' in the statement of the pronunciation of *c, g, t*. The beginner will find 'Exon's Laws,' which are given pretty fully in Chapter V., a rather tough morsel.

The two most important chapters are VI. (Phonology) and VII. (Morphology). Professor Conway is very fair to the non-specialist teacher and pupil in 'distinguishing points which are only probable' from those which he 'counts certain.' Other specialists will naturally find among what Professor Conway counts certain not infrequent instances of what is to them only probable, and *vice versa*. In Chapter VI. the treatment is clear and the examples good. § 101 (pronunciation of *g* before *n*) should be transferred to Chapter V. In § 108 no examples are given of voiced plosives followed by *s*. Some will be found in § 300. § 111 (colloquial shortening of *ū*) might well be left out of a little book like this, as might also §§ 151 and 162 (history of *-sm-* and *-tn-*). It is very difficult to see a reason for the insertion of a page on the Indeterminate Gutturals (§ 173). On the other hand *-ss-*, from *-tt-*, *-dt-*, *-dht-* (§ 166), and the change of intervocalic *s* to *r* (§ 186), require much fuller illustration *on the spot*. In § 180 the phrase '*veho* Gr. ἔχω (older ϝέχω) "I hold,"' without further note, is certainly misleading for the beginner. Where the Greek dialects attest ϝέχω the word means 'carry,' 'offer,' etc., not 'hold' (*σέχω).

In Chapter VII. Professor Conway does not attempt a complete account of Latin morphology, but the things that he selects are illuminating. The account of Gender at the beginning is excellent, and the explanations of difficult problems like the Gerundive and the passive *r* are well done. The selective method, however, leaves the reader rather bewildered, especially in §§ 223-263, and some rearrangement of these sections would make for greater coherence. The really serious omission is the absence of a systematic discussion of the case forms. It is only incidentally that the student is made aware of the *d* of the ablative in Old Latin. In § 245 he is given a plausible explanation of the confusion of the consonantal and *-i-* declensions, but he is left wondering how *hostis* came to have a nominative plural *hostēs*—a reference to § 136 would have helped—or *rēx* an accusative plural *rēgēs*. In the same section the reference to phonetic changes in the genitive singular should either be omitted or explained and illustrated. In § 241 the student is referred to §§ 122, 131-2. If he goes on to read § 133 he will have to decide whether to believe the statement given there about the nominative plural of the first declension, or the statement in § 241 about the nominative plural feminine of *-o-meno-s*.

After dismissing rather cavalierly the discussion of the personal endings in § 281, Professor Conway repents, and in § 296 and §§ 309 ff. touches on some of the problems. § 296 might be omitted, or perhaps rewritten thus: 'the *peculiar* endings of the perfect *-ī*, *-tī*, and *e-re* are probably to be explained as middle terminations (see § 308).'

It is to be regretted that this most pleasant little book bears so many marks of over-hasty preparation for the press. The corrections necessary run to many scores. References are sown liberally in the text—and rightly—but often Professor Conway uses the sack and not the hand, and there are not a few wrong references. All Greek words are supposed to be translated. Large numbers are left untranslated (occasionally with disconcerting results to the Greekless reader). There is no consistency in the marking of the quantity of long vowels in Latin words: *mēns* gets its due mark (sometimes), but *pons* is denied it, and a glance at p. 110 will show the vicissitudes of the *-ō* of the first person singular. In the placing or omission of the accent on Sanskrit words I can discover no rule but 'the taste and fancy of the speller' (*e.g.*, *dadhāmi* on p. 33, followed by *dadāmi* on p. 34). The same remark applies to the use of capitals and contractions.

Sanskr. and Sans. jostle one another, and there is a gay mixture of Old Latin, old Lat., Old Lat., while expressions like 'nominative singular masculine' have as many varieties as the spellings of 'college' or 'scholarship' in a sixteenth-century benefactor's will. The mark * is made to bear a heavy burden, and things like **Ácha evoi*, **súpsmere*, **supogerō*, **éncritus*, lead to interesting reflections on the comparative chronology of phonetic laws. *iouxmentum* is an odd form to infer from the *iouxmenta* of the inscription which first gave us the nominative *sakros*.

But these are very small things. Professor Conway makes his subject live. We feel that he is telling us a story that he himself is enjoying, and he tells it with a charm that holds our interest throughout. He deserves well of all who have at heart the study of language, and one hopes that *The Making of Latin* will soon be in the hands of every sixth form classical master and mistress in the country.

SIDNEY G. CAMPBELL.

TWO BOOKS ON GREEK SCIENCE.

Greek Biology and Medicine. By HENRY OSBORN TAYLOR. One vol. 12mo. Pp. xv + 153. London, Calcutta, Sydney: Harrap and Co. 5s. net.

Greek Biology and Greek Medicine. By CHARLES SINGER. One vol. 12mo. Pp. 128. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.

DOES the passion for history and archaeology, in our day so general, signify a waning of creative genius, a looking back of men not pressing forward to new ideals? The history of the day is inspired by the methods of natural science, which itself indeed is a kind of history, but more analytic and adaptive than creative. At any rate, we may be thankful that our history is good, and that good history is being served out to the public in portions as wholesome and digestible as the two little books before us. To present within the limits of some hundred and fifty small pages a summary of Greek biology and medicine, not without shrewd glances at later and even modern phases of these studies, seems to be, if not an impossible, yet a very difficult feat; yet these little volumes have gone far to attain it. They are brief without being superficial or crabbed, and are agreeably different in their ways. Dr. Taylor dwells more on general principles, Dr. Singer is more occupied with particulars, so that the two books are complementary. Dr. Singer indeed, in his ardour for scientific method, appears at times to vilipend the essential part of hypothesis in this method. As said one of the most accurate of methodical experimenters, Dr. Stephen Hales, 'it is from these kind of conjectures that fresh discoveries first take their rise.'[1] Dr. Taylor has blended the biology and the medicine in one essay; Dr. Singer, perhaps to less advantage, has treated them separately. The disadvantage may be seen, for instance, in his biological section, where for the memorable Alexandrian school the reader is referred to the medical section.

Dr. Taylor dwells upon the wonderful Ionian mind, the fine qualities of which were diffused throughout the receptive Greek peoples. Dr. Singer makes a happy adventure among Minoan relics, and gives illustrations from vase paintings showing curiously exact observation of certain specific features in animal drawing; such as teeth, talons, and so forth. But I desiderate in both authors still a little more consideration of pre-Hippocratic medicine. Our materials are very scanty, it is true; but neither of them even alludes to the evidence of the Homeric epics. Dr. Singer, with the freshness of personal study, sets forth admirably the spirit and achievements of the Hippocratic and Cnidian schools; but it cannot be supposed that all this lore was won in a generation. 'Hippocrates' must have been the flower of a great Greek medical tradition owing curiously little to neighbouring lands; a vanished school to which Homer bears undesigned witness.

[1] *Statical Essays* II., Praef. v., 3rd ed., 1769.

He was not content to recite in general terms the wounds of the warriors as mere casual slashing; he records each stab with anatomical precision, describing the path of the weapon and its effects.

Let us take a few out of many examples: The spear (E. 65-68), driven through the buttock, pierces the urinary bladder, and comes out under the symphysis pubis (*ὑπ' ὀστέον*). The rock hurled by Ajax strikes Hector on the breast; Hector turns faint, pants for breath, and *spits blood*. By an epigastric wound (Π. 481) the *pericardium* is exposed (*ἔνθ' ἄρα τε φρένες ἔρχαται ἀμφ' ἀδινὸν κῆρ*). In another place Homer explains (X. 328) that, after the spear of Achilles had transfixed his neck, Hector could still speak, because the weapon had missed the trachea—a neat bit of vivisection. Yet more remarkable is the record (Θ. 83-86) of the rotatory movements of one of the horses of Nestor which followed the stab of a spear at the base of the skull 'where the mane ceases' (*καίριον*, a deadly spot); the weapon had pierced into the cerebellum. And how Dantesque is the touch describing how the shaft of the lance which had pierced a warrior's chest throbbed with the throbbing of his heart. We may wonder not only at the poet's surgery, but also that his hearers were prepared to comprehend such particulars, as laymen might have done in the later time of Cato or Celsus.[1] We gather that there were many other *ἰητῆρες κακῶν* with the Greek forces (see N. 213 *ὁ δ' ἰητροῖς ἐπιτείλας*) beside Podaleirius and Machaon, who may have been chiefs of a great medical tradition or school. And no doubt there were many more among the *δημιοεργοί* in civil life. It would appear, not that the doctors grew out of the priests, but that the priests were parasitic on the doctors.

Dr. Singer's book is enlivened by many illustrations, some of which I have mentioned. Among others is one of the Socias vase, on which Achilles is depicted skilfully bandaging the wounded arm of Patroclus. But this of course carries us down to the fifth and sixth centuries. In another edition Dr. Singer might add a print of the fragment of bas-relief figured by Inghirami (*Gall. Omerica*), on which Philoctetes appears with a cleverly bandaged foot.[2]

Both authors deal with Aristotle as adequately as possible within their limits, giving each about one-third of his space to this amazing man, so imperfectly or perversely appreciated until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Dr. Singer speaks of his work as a man of science—well, so let it be, with some qualification. Was he not rather a naturalist of the kind of which Gilbert White was a lowly instance? Aristotle carried patient, vigilant, and precise observation of nature to a power beyond all other men. How marvellous this faculty was in him both our authors illustrate for us; but if science consists in the *experimental method*, this we can hardly claim for Aristotle. He made many experiments, as others had done before him, but he can hardly be said to have made them methodically on the principle of 'trial and error,' and control, unless in the sphere of embryology; but here the author of the *π. γονῆς* (*e.g.* Sect. II. 29, Littré) had preceded him. The honour of the experimental *method* we must attribute to Galen, who first made the call which Harvey, unwittingly perhaps, repeated: 'Don't think, but try!' Nevertheless, we are at one with Dr. Singer in resenting the precocious speculation which has been the mirage of natural research. A chief debt to the Ionian philosophers, Aristotle, and Galen, is that they taught men to regard the living body, and indeed the cosmos, as a whole—as a system of reciprocal reactions. This breadth of view extends to Aristotle's reflections on the mind in animals, in children, and in men and women. As Dr. Taylor says, we look to the great Greeks not for specific instruction, but for the spirit of research, wisdom, and ethics.

In view of new editions, we decidedly prefer Dr. Singer's plan of placing his

[1] The pest which attacked mules and dogs before men seems fortunately to be extinct; still, in this passage also we have some medical particulars.

[2] May *ἄωτος* possibly mean 'lint'?

notes at the foot of the page, and an index in each book would be welcome; and I desire to protest against the fashion of certain printers of the day who, as in Dr. Taylor's book, put the page numbers in the wrong place—an inconvenient and unscholarly freak.

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

SENECA'S MODERN MESSAGE.

Seneca: The Philosopher and his Modern Message. By R. M. GUMMERE. Pp. xvi + 150. London: Harrap, 1922. Cloth. 5s. net.

THE first volume of the new American series *Our Debt to Greece and Rome* is *Seneca the Philosopher and his Modern Message*, from the pen of the Loeb translator, Dr. R. M. Gummere.

The first chapter is biographical, the second deals with Seneca's influence upon Pagan Rome, the third with the appeal which his blend of humanity and Stoicism made to the Christian Church. The next three chapters describe successively his influence upon the medieval mind, the Renaissance, and Montaigne and the Elizabethans. The seventh chapter carries us from Bacon down to our own times. Two or three pages of 'Conclusions' suggest that the philosopher's influence is by no means spent, and are followed by brief notes and yet briefer bibliography.

There are some curious slips in the book, and indeed both arrangement and style sometimes give the impression of somewhat hasty composition. A passage from the second chapter may serve to show what I mean:

> Literature was in the hands of specialists and the general public, especially in the age of Tiberius, was mentally starved. 'After the time of Augustus,' says Fronto, ... one hundred years later, 'ideas were threadbare and mouldy. And the emperors from Tiberius to Vespasian were as much ashamed of the spoken and written word as they were disgusted with morals and sorry for crimes.' Something novel was necessary, and it was found in the development of the *elocutio novella*—the Euphuism of Rome—which began at this time to grow and which burgeoned to its full bloom in the period of the Antonines. Seneca adapted the language of the business world to the artificial style of the scholar and man of letters.

Surely this passage of Fronto (p. 123 n.) is concerned only with the *oratorical powers* of the *emperors*. Caesar and Augustus, Fronto thinks, had some eloquence; *nonnihil reliquiarum* (he goes on) *iam uietarum et tabescentium Tiberio illi superfu(it)*. 'Ideas' is an interpolation of Dr. Gummere's, like 'spoken and written word' for *uerborum* just below: the threadbare, mouldy style was that of Tiberius, not his subjects. 'As for the emperors from thence onwards to Vespasian, they,' Fronto says, 'were all *eiusmodi ut non minus uerborum puderet quam pigeret morum et misereret facinorum*'—Rome was as ashamed of their eloquence as she was sick of their ways and sorry for their crimes. But even if Dr. Gummere's interpretation could be accepted, it would be impossible to accept his implication that the *elocutio nouella* has anything to do with Seneca. It was just because his writings had none of the false antique about them that Fronto and Gellius, the chief representatives of that Wardour-Street style, had the contempt for him which Dr. Gummere describes so well on pp. 40-42.

This is by no means the only passage by which I think that non-specialist readers will be puzzled and perhaps positively misled. All the same, the book is full of interesting matter, and will be found invaluable by anyone who wishes to know the truth about one of the most misrepresented figures of Latin literature. Lovers of Seneca will rejoice that the task of writing it has been entrusted to hands so sympathetic; those who still cling to the conventional view of his character (sufficiently represented by Milton's epigram 'Seneca in his books a philosopher') should read what Dr. Gummere has to say on the other side.

It would perhaps have been better to go a little more fully into the cases of writers upon whom Seneca exercised a really strong influence, such as Montaigne and Rousseau—even at the cost of sacrificing some quotations which

seem to me to have little to do with a modern message, and of which extreme examples will be found on p. 133 (quotation from 'Herman Melville, writer of sea-tales') and p. 134 (reference to a poem of R. W. Dixon's, in which Gallio describes to his brother Seneca the interview with St. Paul). We are told that Maeterlinck rates Seneca high, in one of his essays refers to a saying of his, and expresses high esteem for Pintrel's version of the Letters: one would like to know whether the philosopher's influence upon him is really marked.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield.

THE IDEA OF IMMORTALITY.

The Idea of Immortality. (The Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh in the year 1922.) By A. SETH PRINGLE-PATTISON. One vol. Pp. xii+210. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. 12s. 6d.

THE review of Greek beliefs about immortality is mainly contained in three of the ten lectures in this volume. The author was not undertaking to add anything to our knowledge here, or even to set the known facts in a new light. Within its brief limits the treatment is lucid and well-informed. Orphism and its developments in Plato overshadow what Professor Pringle-Pattison calls the 'official faith in Greece.' He identifies this with the Homeric religion, and says that its effect was 'to make the idea of a future life entirely inoperative' (p. 22). It may, perhaps, be objected that the Eleusinian Mysteries (which are not mentioned) were 'official,' and that many initiates must have read into the promise of a 'better lot' in the other world more than the actual formulæ warranted. The statement that 'the later Pythagoreans, when they became a scientific school in the course of the fifth century, dropped altogether the religious and mystical side of their founder's teaching' (p. 33) ignores Philolaus and other Pythagoreans of the dispersal.

The author states in an interesting way the case against the animistic doctrine of a soul-substance. Some dissatisfaction may be felt with his description of the origin of this conception. He speaks of 'the notion of soul or ghost or spirit' as 'first framed by primitive man as an explanation of certain features of his experience,' and calls animism a theory—'an effort to rationalise, to give a causal explanation of the pell-mell of occurrences' (p. 7). This seems to rest upon the very common fallacy that man in the myth-making stage behaves like the modern scientific man, who takes as his data the objective phenomena of the sense-world, and proceeds to construct hypotheses to reduce them to order. Is it not more likely that the 'notion,' or rather the *image*, 'of soul or ghost or spirit' is just as much a given fact as any sense-object, and is not distinguished as belonging to a different order from any other part of experience? Myths, and for that matter early scientific cosmologies, are not descriptions of natural phenomena accompanied by explanations or hypotheses: they are narratives, in which the natural and the imaginary elements are indissolubly fused. Not only is the image of the soul or ghost given in dreams and apparitions, but there is also the experience which gives rise to the continually reappearing notion of 'the one ego lying unchanged alike beneath its simultaneous variety and its temporal succession' (Lotze, quoted p. 79). I do not know whether this experience can be explained as the dim, but constant, awareness of the existence of the huge mass of mental content which is not within the shifting field of consciousness at any given moment. But I am convinced that the notion of substance as the permanent substrate persisting through change is not, as the author seems to hold (p. 73), originally derived from material bodies and thence applied to the soul. It is, on the contrary,

derived from the inner experience of personal continuity, and thence projected into the external world.

Such questions as these, however, cannot be pursued here; nor do these differences of opinion much affect the value of Professor Pringle-Pattison's able review of ancient and modern beliefs.

F. M. CORNFORD.

GREEK MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS.

Mathematics and Physical Science in Classical Antiquity. Translated from the German of J. L. Heiberg, by D. C. MACGREGOR. One vol. Crown 8vo. Pp. 110. Oxford University Press, 1922. 2s. 6d. net.

THE authorities of the Clarendon Press are to be congratulated on including in their series of *The World's Manuals* this admirable little book. Within its compass we know of no other sketch of Greek science to compare with it. It is also thoroughly trustworthy; for if anyone was ever qualified to write such a book it is Dr. Heiberg, who has himself edited the Greek text of most of the Greek mathematicians, to say nothing of Simplicius on the *De Caelo* of Aristotle, etc. The translation by Mr. Macgregor is, on the whole, extremely well done; and, by splitting up the long and sometimes involved German periods into shorter and crisper sentences, he has made the whole presentation more vivid and readable. Inaccuracies there are, but these are as a rule slight and do not detract greatly from the merit of the translation; some are misprints—*e.g.*, 'last' for 'lost,' in line 19 of p. 75. It is necessary, however, to notice a few errors of substance which it would be well to correct when a reprint becomes necessary. (1) On p. 36 we are told that the curve on a sphere known as the *hippopede* of Eudoxus 'was used by Archytas for the curve mentioned on p. 34.' This is incorrect; Heiberg rightly says that Eudoxus' curve is '*akin to* the above-mentioned curve of Archytas' ('verwandt mit,' 'akin to,' not 'used by' or 'for'). (2) The famous Cattle-Problem in the epigram attributed to Archimedes is said (p. 62) to 'concern the solution of an indeterminate equation.' Heiberg says: 'What is involved is a solution of indeterminate equations' (in the plural). The translator should have said 'a set of indeterminate equations'; but even Heiberg's statement is too compressed, and it would have been well to give a little more detail. (3) On p. 65 we learn that Apollonius, in the lost treatise in which he explained his system of expressing large numbers (in powers of 10,000), playfully connects this investigation with a verse 'the letters of which he *added up* according to their numerical value.' The mistake here is Heiberg's own ('addierte'). But the numbers represented by the letters in the hexameter were *multiplied*, not added; otherwise the example would not have served to illustrate Apollonius' system. For the sum of the numbers comes to 3,358 only, whereas their continued product contains, in our notation, 55 digits. (4) The curves investigated by Perseus (p. 76), 'die spirischen Linien,' were not 'spirals,' but *spiric* curves—*i.e.* curves produced by certain plane sections of the σπεῖρα, which was a *tore* or anchor-ring.

T. L. HEATH.

EPICURUS.

Epicuri epistulae tres et ratae sententiae a Laertio Diogene servatae. Edidit P. VON DER MUEHLL. One vol. 6″×4″. Pp. x+69. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922. 3s. 6d.

THIS, which styles itself a school edition, is wholly devoted to the text. There is an ample *apparatus criticus* 2 or 3 inches deep on most of the pages (see p. 51); and in the Preface the editor deplores the modern tendency to curtail information respecting readings. Not content with minutely revising by repeated collations the work already done, he has used three new MSS.: one, Co, from the library of the old Seraglio at Constantinople, another, W, from the Vatican Library, both of which are allied to the best Paris MS., P. It is mentioned that sometimes the readings of Co agree with the corrections of the Borbonicus. The last of the three, Z, though worthless in itself, is of great interest, being claimed as the identical MS. provided by Marcus Aurigallus, from which Hieronymus Frobenius printed the *editio princeps*. The identification seems clearly made out. Amongst many instances in the *apparatus* where Z^3f agree, is one (§ 48) where they alone have the true reading ἐπιπολῆς, which has in all other collated MSS. been supplanted by ἐπὶ πολλῆς. Some use has been made of various Byzantine epitomes. The most important, Φ, is ascribed, in part at least, to Hesychius of Miletus, whereas in reality it is of much later date. In constituting the text, Von der Muehll is as cautious as Bignone is enterprising. He relegates to critical notes many of Usener's emendations, so warmly praised by Bywater (*C.R.* II. p. 278 ff.). The treatment by the two men of the lacuna in § 39 (p. 5, 11) is instructive. Usener supplied thus: τὸ πᾶν ἐστι <σώματα καὶ τόπος>. His successor returns to Gassendi, who read σώματα καὶ κενόν, and three lines below εἰ < δὲ > μὴ ἦν ὁ κενὸν καὶ χώραν καὶ ἀναφῆ φύσιν ὀνομάζομεν. Usener's choice of τόπος was prompted by his method of dealing with the second passage, where he altered τὸ πρόσθεν into τόπος δέ, thus proceeding: τόπος δὲ εἰ μὴ ἦν, ὃν κενὸν . . . ὀνομάζομεν.

Gassendi reaches the desired end with the minimum of change, but does not account for the well-supported reading ὃ* of the Borbonicus which has become ὃν in $PCoFZ^1$. The

glosses and scholia, which Usener separated from his text and printed between it and the critical notes, return, in this new edition, to their place in the codices (though in smaller type, between round brackets), even if, as in § 40 (p. 6, 3 f.), it be between the article *τῶν* and its noun *σωμάτων*. The editor adopts the view which makes these insertions responsible in some measure for corruption or occasionally for a lacuna. Thus he extends by one line the intrusive matter in § 50 (p. 11, 3), and treats in the same way as an insertion in § 133 (p. 50, 1-4) the well-known defence of free will, actually prefixing *<λέγει ἐν ἄλλοις. . .>*. Wherever Epicurus said this, he must have been wrought up (as in the letter to Menoeceus) to a fine fervour, to judge by the avoidance of hiatus. Misprints are rare, but on p. v 1523 should be 1533: in *apparatus* to § 143 (p. 53, last line) there is a false concord. On p. viii will be found a very useful list of articles and reviews bearing on the textual criticism of Epicurus. Although the strong point of this recension is its adhesion to the codices, sound emendations, *e.g.* *ἔτι τε* (Arndt) in § 38 and *συμμένει* (Bywater) in § 140, long overdue, win just recognition.

R. D. HICKS.

ROMAN GAMES.

Recherches sur les Jeux romains: Notes d'Archéologie et d'Histoire religieuse. ANDRÉ PIGANIOL. One vol. 250 mm. × 165 mm. Pp. vi.+155, 2 plates (full-page). Strasbourg: Librairie Istra; Oxford University Press, 1923. Fr. 8 (3s. 6d.).

THIS work is the latest *fascicule* of the publications issued by the Faculté des Lettres at Strasbourg. As might be expected from M. Piganiol, it shows ingenuity and learning. The subject is in general the religious significance of the Roman *ludi*, various aspects of which are discussed in a series of essays, new or republished with slight alterations.

The first (*Consus, Dieu du Cirque*) maintains the thesis that the underground altar of that deity was a *mundus* or *puteal*, by which M. Piganiol understands a *bouche infernale*, and that the games were in essence a rite of chthonian or funereal nature, which seems to lose sight of the extreme probability of Consus and his altar having been there before anyone thought of using the *uallis Murciae* to hold races in. Chapter II. (*La Pompa du Cirque*) deals with Fabius Pictor's account of the votive games of A. Postumius. Chapter III. ingeniously suggests that many Etruscan mythological scenes are taken from Etruscan tragedies; Chapter IV. discusses two interesting frescoes from Ostia; Chapter V. has a very seductive explanation of the miraculous burning of Acestes' arrow in *Aen.* V. 522 ff.: it typifies the apotheosis of Aeneas, and by implication that of Caesar. The sixth chapter, the last of the first part of the book, suggests that the *trinci* or *tringui* of the inscription of Marcus Aurelius (Dessau 5163, 9340), regulating the prices of gladiators, are victims put to death by mutual slaughter in a Gaulish rite.

So far the author has been ingenious, suggestive, and often probably right. In the second part of his book he strikes the reviewer as very faulty. There is first a discussion (Chap. I.) of the relation of the *ludi magni* to votive games, which partly depends on M. Piganiol's own theory of the plebs, and must stand or fall with it. After two more essays on particular points come three articles of wider scope: *Le Sens religieux de la Victoire; Les Munera; Le Sens religieux des Jeux.* Here he seems to display a curious lack of historical perspective, coupled with a most uncritical handling of evidence. Thus in discussing Victoria, whom he wants to prove originally a sort of Valkyrie or *κὴρ θανάτοιο*, he gives us the strangest mixture of savage ideas, hypothetical early Italian beliefs, Greek and Etruscan rites, all in explanation of this abstraction, almost certainly of latish date, in Roman cult. Of his use of texts, two examples may be given. He cites, p. 88, Tertullian's scornful words, *quo differt ab epulo Iouis silicernium?* (*Apol.* 13), and proves from that the funereal or chthonian character of the *ludi*. Has it not struck him that the words are taken from a Christian apologist, and their author, like all his kind, accepted the futilities of Euhemeros? On p. 116 he states that 'Une Niké grecque est une Furie, fille de l'Océanide Styx, sœur de divinités cruelles,' for which he cites Hes. *Theog.* 382 ff. But a brief inspection of that passage in its context shows that Hesiod is simply allegorising, as he so often does; Hatred is the mother of Emulation and Victory, also of Strength and Might, without which the palace of Zeus, among other things, cannot subsist. It is a bit of naïve moralising, showing that out of evil cometh good, and has nothing whatsoever to do with cult. In the last two essays the reviewer is of opinion that M. Piganiol is obsessed by 'chthonian' ritual, and that he is very far from having analysed that very complex stratum.

It is much to be hoped that an investigator of such ability and diligence will add to his existing good qualities a severe criticism of his own and other people's theories, and a nicer sense of historical and literary perspective. We should then have from him work of lasting value, as well as of stimulating interest.

H. J. ROSE.

THE LUPERCALIA.

The Lupercalia. By ALBERTA MILDRED FRANKLIN. One vol. 245 mm. × 160 mm. Pp. 105. New York, 1921.

IT is fortunately not necessary for the student of ancient religion to be eminent in archaeology, philology, and anthropology, as well as in his own speciality; but it is his duty to make himself acquainted with the latest results of those sciences. This the author of the above dissertation (a thesis for the degree of Ph.D. at

Columbia University) cannot be said to have done. The calmness with which she assumes, for example, that the original speakers of Wiro —to use Dr. Giles's convenient substitute for the unsatisfactory 'Indo-Germanic'—were identical with the Alpine stock, and that the *terramara* people were Alpines; the persistent manner in which she labels them 'Aryans,' as if India, and not Italy, were her subject; the certainty with which she speaks of 'Mediterraneans' as one race (such trifles as the difference between Grimaldi, Crô-Magnon, Combe Capelle, etc., do not seem to trouble her); the ease with which she derives Λυκαῖος from Λύκος, are equalled only by the childlike trust she reposes in the dicta of Ettore Pais, and the readiness with which she believes that product of *decrepita Graecia*, as Cobet well termed it, the *Parallela Minora*. Beside such things as these, and a knowledge of comparative religion which has got but little beyond Tylor and Mannhardt, small slips, such as Αἰγιναίας for the nominative, and *pomoerium*, do not matter much.

The collection of material is painstaking and useful. The explanation given of the ritual of the Lupercalia is that there was originally a cult of a chthonian wolf-god, 'Pelasgian' or 'Mediterranean' in origin; and that borrowings from the worship of Iuno, a Sabine rite of purification by the sacrifice of a dog, and, finally, Orphic ceremonies introduced in the second Punic War, were successively superimposed upon this basis. Through this very hazardous theory come every now and then flashes of ingenuity and insight, which suggest that, as her scholarship ripens, Dr. Franklin will produce something really worth writing.

H. J. ROSE.

PROFESSOR LINDSAY'S *PALAEOGRAPHIA LATINA*.

Palaeographia Latina. Part I.: Edited by PROFESSOR W. M. LINDSAY. [St. Andrews University Publication XIV.] One vol. 8vo. Pp. 66. Five plates (collotype). Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford, 1922. 5s.

SCHOLARS have long felt the need of a vehicle for purely palaeographical investigations. In France, Germany, Austria, and Italy, thanks to periodicals like the *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, *Revue des Bibliothèques*, *Neues Archiv*, *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, or the *Archivio storico Italiano*, it was now and then possible to find space for palaeographical discussions. In England and America the difficulty was considerable. This lack has now been remedied by the appearance of a journal devoted solely to Latin palaeography, whose chief interest will be Latin book-script, to about the middle of the eleventh century. 'The journal will be cosmopolitan. Articles in French, Italian, and German will be as welcome as those in English.' It is to appear semi-annually, and the present cost is five shillings the single issue. It augurs well for the future of the journal that its founder and editor is one who, by his own researches, and by furthering the researches of others, has done more for palaeography than any other living scholar.

The first issue contains two parts: I. The Letters in Early Latin Minuscule (till *c.* 850), by the Editor (pp. 7-61); II. Some Early Scripts of the Corbie Scriptorium, by the late P. Liebaert (pp. 62-66). Four plates illustrate Part II., and one plate Part I. Both parts constitute distinct contributions to palaeography.

In the half-century since Wattenbach published his *Anleitung*, Latin palaeography, thanks chiefly to Traube, has made enormous progress. Especially noticeable is the change in the point of view. We are no longer content with merely registering specimens. We strive to classify our examples, to discover their mutual relationship, and to point out the larger bearing of these facts upon philology and history. It is this method that differentiates Lindsay's treatment from Wattenbach's. 'In writing this account,' says Professor Lindsay, 'I have sought to help (1) palaeographers, by supplying suitable names, under which this or that form can be referred to (*e.g.*, cursive Insular *e*) and (2) Latin scholars, by showing what letters and ligatures of letters were most easily mistaken by medieval transcribers.' Every palaeographer, and every Latin scholar whose researches bring him in contact with our oldest Latin MSS., will lose no time in acquainting himself with the mass of important material crowded into these sixty pages. It is safe to say that not another living scholar could have given us this study, for it is based on personal inspection of a great many hundred MSS. examined and re-examined during countless *itinera palaeographica*. To one who, like the reviewer, has been privileged to see a good many of these MSS. himself, it is a temptation to go into detail with regard to each letter discussed. But, within the limits of this review, it is impossible to say more than that Professor Lindsay's study is full of good observations and helpful hints, and is henceforth indispensable.[1]

Of smaller interest to classical scholars, but of quite unusual importance to palaeography,

[1] Letter *Q*: the open form, resembling Winithar's variety, is found in the sixth-century palimpsest Vatic. lat. 5766. It would be important to establish if this is a Burgundian variety. Letter *R*: the elongated form found in Visigothic script (Cava Bible) in the ligature *rn*, *rm*, deserve mention. Letter *Z*: a form resembling figure 2 with the main stroke descending far below the line, and the upper curve shrunk to a narrow loop, is found in the curious minuscule of Verona 62 (60). The unique form to which attention is called in the Bobbio Missal is not a *z* but a *c*, as Delisle correctly interpreted. The same form occurs in the words *citi* and *cesares* and *factam* on the page that has *lacarus* (fol. 8).

is Part II., containing Professor Lindsay's account of Liebaert's views of the development of writing at Corbie during the eighth century. It took the fine eye of Liebaert to discover that what Traube has called the 'old script of Corbie' (which I call the *a-b* type) was by no means the oldest minuscule practised in that celebrated centre; that, in fact, three other distinct types of minuscule preceded it. 'Preceded' is the word used by the editor, but it would perhaps be more accurate to say synchronised with it. These types are (1) the beautiful minuscule with characteristically tall *e* (when in ligature with *r* or *s*, etc.), and maiuscule *N*; (2) the Leutchar type, of about the middle of the century (this type I should call Corbie half-uncial in its latest stages; it is not minuscule properly speaking; if it is, there is no sense in retaining the classification half-uncial, which I contend serves a useful purpose); (3) the Maurdramnus type, named after a Corbie abbot (772-780). This is a perfectly developed minuscule of the Caroline type, with the typical Corbie form of *y*. These three types are unmistakable, and it is greatly to Liebaert's credit that he recognised and described them. What a loss his premature death has been to palaeography can be gathered from this discovery alone. The statement, however, that these three types are older than the *a-b* type, the present writer finds it hard to accept. During the eighth century Corbie was a great centre for the copying of books. This is proven by a large quantity of eighth-century MSS. coming from Corbie. The graphic features presented by these MSS. suggest that two streams of influence met at Corbie and flowed side by side for nearly a century. I should call the one the Luxeuil influence, the other the Tours influence, using Tours and Luxeuil not so much to indicate direct impact of these two abbeys upon Corbie as to express the two types of writing represented by these abbeys. The script we call Luxeuil was certainly known and probably used at Corbie (witness MS. Paris lat. 12205).[1] It is the direct progenitor of the Laon type, of the *b* type, and of the *a-b* type. It can be proven that the peculiar *b* typical of the *a-b* MSS. was known at Corbie while the *e-n* type was in use,[2] and that this type was in use while Lindsay's fourth type was in vogue. The glorious series of MSS. in the *a-b* type represent the highest point reached in a development that goes back to the seventh century, and may be said to have started with such books as the Paris Avitus (MS. 8913). While this development was taking its natural course, which was not limited to Luxeuil and Corbie (some day we may discover that it penetrated south as far as Paris, certainly as far as Beauvais), there is noticeable in France another tendency—I refer to the attempts at a minuscule based upon what Traube calls quarter-uncial. This tendency bore its finest fruit in the products of the school of Tours. Its early efforts may be studied in such examples as Épinal 68, and Paris Nouv. Acq. 1575. These two tendencies met and ran a parallel course at Corbie; for otherwise, one would have to assume that, for some inexplicable reason, a Merovingian type (*a-b* type) was allowed to re-appear, and to be cultivated to the highest point of perfection, despite the fact that under abbots Leutchar and Maurdramnus a simple, clear, and extremely legible minuscule had been developed. That assumption seems untenable. But the last word on the school of Corbie has not been spoken. It is devoutly to be hoped that a more detailed treatment, based upon Liebaert's notes on the subject, will be forthcoming.

E. A. LOWE.

[1] On fol. 157, after the colophon, we have a line in Luxeuil script. On fol. 2, the pen trial dnē ihū xpē is in pure Corbie *a-b* type; on fol. 26^{v} there are four lines in the *e-n* type.

[2] See Paris lat. 4403A fol. 181, and Paris lat. 13347 fol. 23^{v}.

Early Latin Hymns. With Introduction and Notes by the late A. S. Walpole. (Cambridge Patristic Texts.) One vol. 8vo. Pp. xxviii + 446. Cambridge University Press, 1922. 15s. net.

MR. WALPOLE had originally intended to present in a single *Corpus* all Latin hymns not only written but sung in church before 600 A.D. Considerations of space induced him to change his purpose, omitting some as of inferior literary merit (*e.g.*, only one by Ennodius is included), and others of whose date there is doubt or dissension in the world of scholarship.

Mr. Walpole died in 1920. A few days before his death he sent his material to Dr. A. J. Mason, who has completed the task with the piety which might have been expected of him, and the result is a work of great utility to classical scholars and hymnologists alike; but the notes could not be used as they stood, and in some departments (*e.g.*, the *apparatus criticus*) he has been forced to depart widely from Mr. Walpole's scheme.

A general introduction explains the supersession of the 'Old Hymnal' (of Benedict, Caesarius, and Aurelian of Arles) by the 'Later Hymnal,' whose contents are found in English and Irish manuscripts. The latter has won the day in the services of the Church, and the former is only represented by some survivors in the Ambrosian and Mozarabic liturgies. A few however from the earlier collection appeared in the later as well, including some by St. Ambrose himself, and that is why we are still familiar with such fine poems as *Aeterne rerum conditor* and *Aeterna Christi munera*.

All the important hymns are provided with an individual introduction, giving any possible clue to date and authorship; and below the text is (1) a careful *apparatus criticus* (in which indeed there is almost more detail than the average scholar requires), and (2) an explanatory and illustrative commentary. Good examples may be found in the two splendid odes composed by Venantius Fortunatus for the reception at Poitiers by Queen Radegund of

the fragment of the True Cross sent her from Constantinople, *Pange lingua gloriosi*, and *Vexilla regis prodeunt*. With the information here provided the reader is able to grasp the occasion of their writing, the extent to which these were afterwards (and are still) liturgically used, and to construe them word for word—a process not always easy, the Latin being at once so compact and allusive. (I could wish that Mr. Walpole or Dr. Mason had occasionally given a reference to standard English translations by Dr. Neale or others; some whose Latin is a little rusty would have been glad to help themselves by being able to turn up an English version in *Ancient and Modern* or the *English Hymnal*.)

A few general grammatical notes conclude, but do not quite complete, the volume, for a metrical appendix would have been welcome. The student has here the 127 best hymns of the early Church; and it is to be hoped that the book will receive attention, not only from the ecclesiastical student, but also from the Latin scholar who has no particular interest in things liturgical or ecclesiastical. The successful adaptation of Latin to a totally new set of ideas and ideals, proceeding from a very different culture, is a linguistic phenomenon which should excite both our surprise and admiration; and many of the hymns here edited (such as the two last mentioned above) compare favourably as pure poems with any secular literature of the Silver Age.

S. GASELEE.

An Introduction to the Study of Terra Sigillata. By F. OSWALD and T. DAVIES PRYCE. One vol. 4to. Pp. xii+286. Eighty-five full-page plates with explanatory text. London: Longmans, 1920. £2 2s.

FOR the last twenty-five years a knowledge of 'Samian Ware' has been recognised as one of the most important qualifications for any student of Roman Imperial archaeology, and the subject has during that period steadily increased in difficulty owing to the rapid accumulation of knowledge concerning the history and development of this kind of pottery. In 1896 Dragendorff classified its products into over fifty standard shapes; in 1904 Déchelette published his monumental work on the decoration of central and southern Gaulish wares; and a number of other students helped to accumulate a mass of literature, all of which had perforce to be mastered, more or less, by anyone who undertook to study the most insignificant Roman provincial site. The time was ripe for a comprehensive work, in which all the available material should be sifted and digested; and it is a matter for congratulation that the work has been done, and thoroughly well done, by English hands. Messrs. Oswald and Pryce realised the necessity of such a book while engaged in excavation, an experience shared by plenty of other excavators; but they went further, and set about filling the gap of which we were all conscious. The result is that they have produced a standard work. Constant use of the book only increases one's idea of its value, and every excavator of a Roman site in Britain will keep a copy on his office table. As for Continental archaeologists, if they do not use it the loss will be theirs, for they have no book that can quite take its place.

The authors have wisely not attempted to supersede all previous works, and for the identification of decorated fragments (for instance) Déchelette is as necessary as ever. But Messrs. Oswald and Pryce have done at least one piece of work which supplements Déchelette—namely, the collection of types of ovolo. This will be of very great value to the working archaeologist. For the most part, however, they approach the decoration of Samian vessels with an eye rather to its historical antecedents than to its minute variations from potter to potter. The plates, excellent though they are for their purpose, suffer from a certain inelegance and crudity of draughtsmanship. For this we do not blame the authors. They have rightly chosen to do their own drawings as best they can rather than to hire a skilled artist whose archaeological knowledge would be inferior to their own. A man may draw well, but if he does not know exactly what to look for his drawings are archaeologically valueless, and it is better to have illustrations done by the man who knows what he wants illustrated than by one who can turn out a prettier finished picture. Mr. Oswald's drawings may be artistically poor, but archaeologically they are excellent.

R. G. COLLINGWOOD.

Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi. By J. M. HARDEN, B.D., LL.D. One vol. Demy 8vo. Pp. xxxi+196. London: S.P.C.K., 1922. 10s.

THIS excellent critical edition of Jerome's translation of the Psalter from the original Hebrew raises the Psalter to the level, not only of the remaining Canonical Books of the Vulgate Old Testament, but of the critical Oxford *Editio Minor* of the New Testament. It stands related to the Gallican Psalter of the 'authorised' Vulgate much as the Psalter of our Revised Version does to that of the Anglican Prayer-Book.

The history and relative value of the various MSS. collated, and the principles on which the resultant text is based, are fully and clearly set forth in the introduction, and the evidence for the reading adopted in each case is given in the footnotes. Thus the text is derived from original research, and is not a mere recension of any former edition.

Noteworthy features are: British MSS. are here used for the first time (not to speak of the famous Codex Amiatinus); the numerous quotations found in the *Speculum* are marked in the text; and three valuable indices are appended, giving a list of late or unusual words and of important various readings.

In short, Dr. Harden has conferred a great boon on Vulgate students, and is to be congratulated on the result of his arduous and scholarly labours.

W. E. PLATER.

Theory of Advanced Greek Composition, with Digest of Greek Idioms. By JOHN DONOVAN, S.J., M.A. Two vols. Demy 8vo. Vol. I.: pp. xiv+124; Vol. II.: pp. 208. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1921-2. Vol. I., 5s. net; Vol. II., 7s. net.

THIS is a most useful book, but it is a pity that the author does not indicate in the Preface to Part I. how he advises the reader to deal with the mass of material he has collected. In the Preface to Part II. he says that 'it will be advisable for students who have already acquired some knowledge of Greek' (surely there will be no others who will venture on two volumes—and apparently a third to follow—on Advanced Greek Prose Composition!) 'to begin by assimilating the general principles set forth in this second part.' But before the reader reaches this point, he may have been disheartened by the unnecessary multiplication of 'Processes' in the Introduction to Part I. and the somewhat frigid and over-elaborate classification that follows, and may lay the book aside without realising that the author is really concerned almost entirely with what is, after all, the crucial test—the process of finding Greek vocabulary and idiom.

This process is in point of fact so difficult for the average composer that all others must be subordinated to it, and elaborate systems break down accordingly. Father Donovan, after proposing his system, is practical enough to concentrate almost exclusively on his Process 3, which is 'the finding by the student of Greek equivalents of the various portions of the English he is about to transfer into Greek.'

The Classification of the Fundamental Differences in Part II. is very good, and it is quite possible to read this part as a whole, as well as to use it for reference. From it further references to Part I. can be advantageously pursued, if desired. In this way the book can be systematically used, and the alphabetical arrangement of the examples will also be of assistance. But in any case, if we open the book purely at random and read a few pages, the wealth of illustration is so great that we cannot fail to establish a more intimate acquaintance with the particular subject treated. The author is fully justified in claiming that each chapter of the work constitutes an independent treatise, which may be studied separately on its own merits; but here again it would perhaps have been wiser to give the reader this hint in the Preface to Part I.

J. E. SCOTT.

[*Iamblichi*] *Theologoumena Arithmeticae.* Edidit VICTORIUS DE FALCO. 12mo. Pp. xvii +90. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922.

AFTER more than a century of complete neglect the appearance of a readable and accessible text of the *Theologoumena Arithmeticae* was long overdue. The *editio princeps* (Paris, 1643) was based on a single manuscript, and that an exceedingly corrupt one. Ast, who re-edited the work in 1817, used no manuscript *subsidia* whatever; he emended conjecturally some of the more obvious errors of the Paris text, but reprinted many more, and added yet others of his own. Both editions are now scarce. Signor de Falco has done much to remedy this discreditable condition of affairs. His thorough collation of eight out of nine known manuscripts has furnished many new readings and enabled him to construct a *stemma codicum*, which at last makes a critical edition possible. His temperament as an editor is, however, unduly conservative: he relegates to footnotes some practically certain emendations (*e.g.* at p. 76, l. 12); and he retains without comment a number of readings which can hardly stand—*e.g.* p. 7, l. 16, τοῦτο αὐτὸ (read τὸ αὐτὸ); p. 47, l. 14, διχῆ (the context surely requires τριχῆ); p. 58, l. 9, πρὸς αὐτοῖς (read πρὸς αὐτὰς). On p. 44, l. 4, ἐπὶ μέρους seems a certain correction for ἐπιμελοῦς or ἐπὶ μελοῦς: *cf.* p. 50, ll. 18 f. P. 45, l. 8, the structure of the sentence appears to demand εἰ διαρθρωτική. On the other hand, at p. 84, l. 6, no remedy is needed except the removal of the comma after ἐξαιρετέον. A good many other and more difficult passages still invite the acumen of the ingenious reader, particularly where the two best MSS., both unfortunately fragmentary, fail us. An intelligible translation of the whole work would be very welcome, especially to the non-mathematical.

A valuable feature of Signor de Falco's edition is the large collection of references to parallel passages, not only in Anatolius περὶ δεκάδος (one of the chief immediate sources of the *Theologoumena*), but in Lydus, Theon of Smyrna, Philo, etc. Despite the unbelievable puerilities in which it abounds, the *Theologoumena* is an important text for our knowledge of Pythagorean science. The future historian of Pythagoreanism—if a being so adventurous should yet appear—will have to undertake a critical study of the book, with a view to determining how much of its subject-matter can be traced back to the early Academy and how much to pre-Platonic sources. Signor de Falco has at least laid the foundations for such a study.

E. R. DODDS.

A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the First Thirteen Centuries of our Era. By LYNN THORNDIKE, Ph.D. Two volumes. Pp. xli + 835; ix + 1036. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. Cloth, $10.

IN this rich storehouse of learning the part which concerns classical authors, though copious, is comparatively small; it is prefatory to the author's main interests, and it is more of a survey than a history. Let it then suffice to say that Dr. Thorndike's work must be used by anyone who deals with the scientific and magical lore of Pliny, Seneca, Apuleius, Ptolemy, Galen, Plutarch, and the rest, and that he will be helped by ample extracts, references and indexes.

E. HARRISON.

Namenbuch. By Dr. F. PREISIGKE. Pp. viii+264. Heidelberg, 1922. Obtainable from the author, price $7, or current equivalent.

THIS is a collection of all the personal names so far recovered from the Greek documents of

Egypt, whether preserved on papyrus, ostraca, or other material. Dr. Preisigke, the compiler, is not only an experienced editor of papyri, but also a systematic collector of the corrections which have been made from time to time in the published texts (the fourth and concluding part of his *Berichtigungsliste* has just appeared), and he therefore possessed special qualifications for his laborious task, which has been carried out with characteristic care and thoroughness. The book will not appeal to a wide circle, but as a contribution to the study of Egyptian nomenclature and as a work of reference for those who are concerned with Graeco-Roman documents from Egypt it will be of great service.

Dr. Preisigke has been so untiring in the provision of aids to papyrologists, that one is tempted to wonder whether he will add yet further to their indebtedness, and to suggest that the logical sequel of this index of names would be the general *index verborum*, which may now be reckoned the principal need of the subject. It would no doubt be a serious undertaking, but he would discharge it with the maximum of efficiency and the minimum of effort.

A. S. HUNT.

Orosiana: Syntaktische semasiologische und kritische Studien zu Orosius. Inaugural-dissertation von JOSEF SVENNUNG. One vol. 8vo. Pp. xii+201. Uppsala: A.-B. Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1922. About 9s. 6d. (8 Swedish kr.).

THE year 1907 saw the publication of Einar Löfstedt's *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität*, and with it the foundation of the Swedish school of Latinists, which is now making a bold bid for the primacy in Latin study. The school shows signs of thorough training, takes the whole field of Latin from Plautus to Gregory the Great for its province, and has at its command a practically complete collection of all modern works on Latin that matter, both great and small. The productions of the Swedish school are nearly all written in German, and are thus easily accessible. The moving spirit of the whole is Löfstedt himself. The best works are from his own pen, but his influence can be traced in the writings of pupils like Salonius and Svennung.

The present work is much larger and much more important than the usual dissertation. The syntactical part is divided into seven chapters, concerned with case syntax, use of prepositions, use of adjectives and numerals, use of pronouns, the verb, use of certain particles, *constructio ad sensum*, ellipsis, brachylogy and anacoluthon. The semasiological part is subdivided into four chapters, dealing with substantives, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs. The critical part contains an estimate of the relative value of the manuscripts of Orosius and some miscellaneous critical notes. One appendix treats Orosius's use of the *clausula*, and the other contains an edition—the first published—of a pseudo-Orosian letter to Augustine.

The author has made a thorough study of his subject, and his treatment is convincing. Orosius is not, of course, a writer of primary importance, either for the historian or for the philologist, but account must be taken of him in any comprehensive treatment of Latin literature and language. The work of Svennung contains much that is of importance for the student of classical Latin also. There is, for example, an excellent excursus on the temporal *genetivus relationis*, covering the whole history of the language from Cato the Censor down to the sixth century of our era. The space allowed here forbids the addition of examples from other authors to illustrate Svennung's treatment of various topics. I will merely add another example of *quisquislibet* from Hilarius ap. Augustin. *epist.* 226, § 6. In deciding for the shorter form *idolatria* in preference to the longer form *idololatria* in Orosius, it seems to me that Svennung has come to the wrong conclusion. After a certain date the tendency to write the shorter form was almost irresistible, but what that date was no one has yet told us. The proper procedure would be to find the oldest MS. (of any author whatsoever) that uses the short form, and argue from that. I do not myself believe that the short form existed as early as Orosius. On p. xii for 'VII. (bis *forum*)' read 'VI. (bis *forum*).'

The excellence of this work augurs well for the author's future as a scholar.

A. SOUTER.

Zur Textkritik der Pliniusbriefe. By GUNNER CARLSSON. One vol. 10″×7″. Pp. 74. Lund: Gleerup; Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1922. Price Kr. 2.50.

THIS dissertation, in a University series from the Seminar of Professor Löfstedt of Lund, is a competent piece of critical work, sober and methodical, clearly argued and lucidly written. Its author takes his material from the recent edition of Professor E. T. Merrill, which was briefly reviewed in the *C.R.* for this year, pp. 35 ff. In the Introduction we have an account of the sources of the text of Pliny's epistles and of the progress of its establishment up to the present time. The remainder of the dissertation deals with the textual problems. I have already said that in editing Pliny's letters the chief task was to choose between the variants. Mr. Carlsson in the main addresses himself to one part, but this the chief part of this task—discrimination between the lections of the 'Ten-Book' or BF family and the 'Nine-Book' or MV family. These two differ so much from each other in omissions or insertions, in word-order, as well as in linguistic variants, that they must represent different recensions. Professor Merrill, in disagreement with Keil but in agreement more or less with Kukula, is in general an adherent of the BF family. The greater part of Mr. Carlsson's book is taken up with showing in detail that this adherence is mistaken. Of word variants I need not give examples here, for in the notice already referred to readers of the *C.R.* will find comments on a number of passages where, without regard to their source, BF readings adopted by Mr. Merrill are condemned as intrinsically

inferior. Such we have in ii. 14. 3, iii. 5. 5, iv. 12. 3, v. 6. 4, v. 16. 7, all of them discussed by Mr. Carlsson, and with the same conclusion. In ii. 11. 24, however, where Mr. Merrill with MDV reads 'casu an conscientia fuerat,' I pronounced for the reading of F which adds 'incertum' after 'casu.' After reading Mr. Carlsson's note I now think that here too the MD reading may be right, although no exact parallel to this Tacitean ellipse has been cited from Pliny. To the differences, at first sight very puzzling to students of the text, between the two families in the order of words, a whole chapter is devoted, and the greater trustworthiness of the MD tradition is shown from the places where its readings accord better than its rivals' with the requirements of rhythm and Plinian usage. The author is, however, no slave to a formula. He is aware that 'Keine Handschrift oder Handschriftenfamilie ist fehlerfrei' (p. 23) and he gives examples which, as ii. 5. 9 'me esse credam' MV, 'esse me credam' F Douxa, show that the MD family has its lapses. In his third chapter Mr. Carlsson deals with the recently discovered Pierpont Morgan uncial fragment and the Aldine edition. Both these give the BF tradition, which, with its characteristic depravations, thus goes back at least to the sixth century. A fourth chapter discusses the reading of particular passages. J. P. POSTGATE.

C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Domitiani. By RODGER F. GEPHART. Pp. 120. Philadelphia, 1922.

THIS thesis takes the form of an edition of Suetonius' *Life of Domitian*, in which parallel passages from other authors are quoted in full. In the notes the best authorities are followed, and they will prove useful to those who have not access to such books of reference as the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*. There is no introduction, and no attempt is made to estimate the value of the book as a whole. The author seems to exaggerate the changes which the Flavian emperors introduced into the imperial cult (p. 31), and he is surely wrong in identifying the *acta Tiberii* with the *acta senatus* (p. 113). On the whole, however, the book is a good piece of work. G. H. STEVENSON.

Ἀττικὸν Δίκαιον. Ἑρμηνευτικὰ καὶ διορθωτικὰ εἰς Ἰσαῖον. By P. S. PHOTIADES. (Extracts from Ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ.) Sakellarios, Athens, 1922-3.

THESE researches by Dr. Photiades, which deal with the first four speeches of Isaeus, will be welcome to students of the Attic orators. They are reprinted from *Athena*. The notes on the Pyrrhus and Nicostratus were written after the fire at Smyrna had destroyed the author's books and papers, containing the results of a great deal of work. Dr. Photiades will have the sympathy of all scholars, and it is greatly to be hoped that he will be able to reconstruct his notes on the remaining speeches. Besides introductions dealing with the problems of law and fact presented by the speeches, there are a considerable number of suggestions on the text all worthy of careful consideration, and recommended by the author's obvious mastery of the Isaeus' idiom. Perhaps the most interesting part of these papers is that in which Dr. Photiades deals with the very obscure topic of the precise relationships of the various claimants for the estate of Cleonymus, and then discusses the arguments advanced by the orator. He is inclined to attach value to Isaeus' reiterated suggestion that a will made in anger might be invalid under the Solonian disqualification for madness. Isaeus seems to him to be interpreting with greater freedom the language of the Solonian law. He deduces a further argument that the will is invalidated by the willingness of the beneficiaries under it to meet the rival claimants by birth in a compromise. Both contentions are ingenious and would have appealed to the orator, though if they possessed the legal force Dr. Photiades would give them, it is hard to see why Isaeus doesn't argue them more definitely as legal points. It is possible that the author is over-friendly to his favourite orator; at this time of day, it can hardly be a duty either of patriotism or Christian charity to shield Isaeus from the slings and arrows of Mr. Wyse. But it may be that English scholars are too much abashed by the monumental work which Mr. Wyse has planted on the orator's grave and too much dominated by his distrustful acumen. In any case these papers are a valuable contribution to the study of Attic law and pleading.

F. E. ADCOCK.

OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY REPORTS.

ON February 16, 1923, the Rev. G. C. Richards read a paper on 'Timachidas and the Chronicle of the Temple of Athena at Lindos,' (C. Blinkenberg, *La Chronique du Temple Lindien*, Copenhagen, 1912, and Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*, No. 131, Bonn, 1915).

The date of the *stele* is fixed by the mention of the priest Teisulos to 99 B.C., and the name Timachidas is probably to be derived from Τιμάοχος, Τίμᾱχος, Τιμᾱχίδας dignitatis causa. This Timachidas, a young Rhodian of archaeological tastes, had already devoted much time to the study of the literary authorities, which are largely quoted, but he had not had access to the 'letters and official minutes.' Accordingly his father, Hagesitimos, proposed and carried a decree in the local assembly, appointing him and a colleague, whose duties were obviously only nominal, to draw up an inscription, to have access to the archives in the presence of the secretary of the local senate (μαστροί), and to receive a sum of 200 drachmae.

The 'letters' are attributed in the *stele* to Gorgosthenes, who wrote to the Senate of the capital Rhodes (a copy presumably being sent

to Lindos), and to Hieroboulos, who wrote to the local senate of Lindos. Dr. Blinkenberg has conclusively proved that the destructive fire in the Temple of Athena which is mentioned in the inscription took place about 350 B.C., and that these two priests recorded the lost 'anathemata,' and doubtless gave the rein to their fancy in so doing. This fire would explain the liberality of Artaxerxes Ochus—no doubt inspired by his General, Mentor the Rhodian—who presented valuable jewellery to the state of Rhodes.

Out of these letters and the official minutes Timachidas found it easy to complete his work. He has been identified with great probability as the Rhodian of that name whose work Δεῖπνα is cited by Athenaeus. It was in eleven books of hexameter verse, and apparently dealt *inter alia* with fish, fruit, and flowers, as accessories to banquets. He is probably the same person who wrote a work on Γλῶσσαι, and who produced commentaries on the *Medea*, the *Frogs*, the Κώλαξ of Menander, and the *Hermes* of Eratosthenes. He was accordingly a literary man of some distinction in the first century B.C., and it is attractive to suppose that his work on the Temple inventory was his *primitiae*. In the decree and the inventory there is no room for literary style, but appended to the decree are one complete and two fragmentary Ἐπιφάνειαι of the goddess. The latter are respectively about appearances of Athena in a dream, (*a*) to a priest about a suicide in the temple; (*b*) to an ex-priest during the siege of Rhodes by Demetrius Poliorketes, commanding an appeal for help to Ptolemy Soter (305 B.C.), as a souvenir of which Ptolemy made a great sacrifice, and dedicated twenty pairs of horns of the oxen.

A certain literary style, not that of the Κοινή, may be seen in this narrative, placing him alongside of Ephorus, if not Xenophon, or at any rate with Polemon.

Beside the writers of the letters, twenty-one authorities are stated, most of them completely unknown chroniclers. Two, Hegesias and Myron, are authors of panegyrics upon Rhodes; the former of these wrote also an Ἀττικῆς ἐγκώμιον, of which Strabo (p. 396) gives a fragment. Zeno, the Rhodian, who wrote a local history in fifteen books (Dio. Laert. VII. 33), is no doubt the correspondent of Polybius, and the author quoted in the *stele*. Eudemus, the author of a Λινδιακὸς λόγος, is perhaps the Peripatetic philosopher. But there is no doubt of the identity of Herodotus the Thurian, whose mention of Amasis' linen corslet at Lindos is quoted from II. 182, the word ἀρπεδόνη being used as in III. 47; but whereas Herodotus says each ἀρπεδόνη has 360 ἀρπεδόναι in itself, the inscription says στάμονες. Dr. Blinkenberg thinks that, because Timachidas does not mention the two stone statues of Herodotus, he had only read the information of Herodotus as given by Polyzalos. With these exceptions the authorities cited seem to be writers of local history, and completely unknown. There is one curiosity. One Aielouros wrote on the 'war against the Exagiadae' or should we read 'the six sons of Helios' (ἐξ Ἀλιάδας)? This may have been a pseudonym for a romance writer; or, considering the number of personal names taken from animals, for instance, Σκύλαξ, and many in Fick-Bechtel, *Gr. Personennamen*[2] pp. 314 ff., it may have been the name of a real person.

The additions to our historical knowledge derived from this *stele* are perhaps not very important, but they are clear and unmistakable.

The items add considerably to our information about ancient *anathemata;* the material is sometimes of African lotus or cypress wood; the references to the archaic panel paintings, to the subjects represented ('Kronos receiving his children from Rhea and swallowing them' has not previously been found so early), to the technique (*e.g.*, a wooden figure with head, hands, and feet of ivory), are highly interesting. Altogether we owe a debt to Timachidas, and still more to Dr. Blinkenberg, who has made him a living figure.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK)

(1923.)

ARCHAEOLOGY. — Apr. 2. A. Evans, *The Palace of Minos*, vol. i. [London, Macmillan, 1921. Pp. xxiv+721] (T. L. Shear). 'A masterwork beyond serious criticism.' S. enumerates points where E. has worked in the results of his very latest discoveries.

HISTORY. — Apr. 30. A. E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to* 565 A.D. [New York, Macmillan, 1921. Pp. xvi+444] (W. W. Hyde). Unlike Botsford's recent Greek history, the book lays little emphasis on the culture of the Romans; it is 'authoritative and sound, but dry and matter-of-fact.' H discusses B.'s opinions on various points.

LITERATURE.—Apr. 23. R. J. Walker, *Euripidean Fragments* [London, Burns and Oates, 1920. Pp. 52] (C. W. Peppler). The emendations are clever, but unconvincing and sometimes impossible. — May 7. G. Showerman, *Horace and His Influence* [Boston, Marshall Jones, 1922. Pp. xviii+176] (J. W. Duff). An appreciation of the poet in his environment, and of his influence on the ages and to-day; 'it makes him live again.' J. W. Mackail, *Virgil and his Meaning to the World of To-day* [Boston, Marshall Jones, 1922. Pp. x+159] (N. W. de Witt). 'Calculated to make friends for the Classics and for Virgil.'—May 14. H. Peters, *Zur Einheit der Ilias* [Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922. Pp. 139] (S. E. Bassett).

'Difficult reading for one who does not know Homer almost by heart.' A suggestive analysis of the poem, mapping out the lines of its construction; its interpretations are often probable, but it tends to make Homer a synthesis rather than living poetry.—May 21. J. T. Sheppard, *Pattern of the Iliad* [London, Methuen, 1922. Pp. xi+213] (S. E. Bassett). Highly praised, though certain inaccuracies are pointed out. J. A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer* [Berkeley, University of California Press, 1921. Pp. 275] (D. M. Robinson). A thorough-going 'Unitarian' treatise, which shows how far the pendulum has swung in the last twenty-five years. R. praises the style, and agrees with the main conclusions though criticising some arguments as 'special pleading.'

[The issue for May 14 contains a list of classical articles in non-classical periodicals.]

MUSÉE BELGE XXVII. No. I., 1923.

J. Hubaux, *Le plongeon rituel.* Studies the Porta Maggiore underground basilica (pp. 81, 17 illustrations). The chief bas-relief shows, as Curtis suggested, Sappho's leap at Leucas (Ovid *Her.* xv. 161-84), but Ovid implies her cure, not 'suicide': no ancient evidence for her *dying* there. For source in ritual cp. Strabo 452, Ov. *Fast.* V. 639: 'plongeon rituel' to produce mystic death and rebirth. Sappho figures in relief as the Grande Initiée. Apse was used in first century of Empire by Baptae of Thracian goddess Cotyto (Hor. *Epod.* 17, ps.-Verg. *Epigr.* 13; Juv. II. 91). Her assimilation to Cybele explains some of the other reliefs. E. Merchie, *Notes sur le style de Sidoine Apollinaire.* A. Roersch, *Docts. inédits concernant Liévin Algoet.*

MUSÉE BELGE: BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PÉDAGOGIQUE.

(JAN., 1923.)

AUTHORS: GREEK — *Homer:* J. A. Scott, *Unity of Homer.* An alluring thesis passing too lightly over the difficulties (Delatte). Eug. Petersen, *Homer's Zorn des Achilleus und der Homeriden Ilias* (Berl. and Leipz., de Gruyter, 1920). Unfavourable (Delatte). *Isaeus:* P. Roussel, *Isée: Discours. Texte établi et traduit* (Coll. des Univs. de France. Paris. Soc. d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres' 1922, 16 fr.). Favourable (Delatte).—*Callimachus:* E. Cahen, *Callimaque. Texte établi et traduit* (same publ. 1922, 13 fr.) Text conservative, translation excellent (Delatte). P. Pfeiffer, *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta* (Kleine Texte, Lietzmann, Bonn. Marcus u. Weber 1921). Favourable (Delatte).

LATIN: *Virgil:* E. Galletier (*P. Vergili M.*) *Epigrammata et Priapea* (Hachette, 1920, 10 fr.). Text conservative, and accepts only four as genuine [Ribbeck 5, 7, 8, 10]. On whole praised by Hubaux. A. Guillemin, *Quelques injustices de la critique interne à l'égard de Virgile.* (Thèse. Châlon-sur-Saône, Bertrand, 1921.) A criticism of Norden's method in his work on *Aen.* VI. Praised by Jeanne Hubaux.—*Ovid:* R. Heinze, *Ovids elegische Erzählung.* Teubner, 1919 (publ. 1920). Sound method and original conclusions (Delatte).

GENERAL: A. Cartault, *La Poésie latine* (Collection Payot, Paris, 1922, 4 fr). A neat summary. (P. Faider, who emphasises the originality of Latin poetry). *Vaison et ses antiquités romaines*, described by P. Faider.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JANUARY-APRIL, 1923.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Pindaros* [Berlin, 1922, Weidmann. Pp. 528] (Schroeder). Poems dealt with chronologically after brilliant description of the setting; chief attention directed to personal and literary questions. W. is like a great winnowing-fan separating grain from chaff.—R. Pfeiffer, *Kallimachosstudien* [München, 1922, Hueber. Pp. 124] (Sitzler). Necessary supplement to P.'s edition of the new fragments of Callimachus, giving reasons for his interpretations of single passages and whole papyri. Convincing.—E. Drerup, *Homerische Poetik. I. Band: Das Homerproblem von E. Drerup. III. Band: Die Rhapsodien der Odyssee von F. Stürmer* [Würzburg, 1921, Selbstverlag des Herausgebers. Pp. xvi+512 and xii+632] (Sitzler). Vol. I.: The most significant work hitherto produced by supporters of the unity of Homer. Vol. III.: After detailed analysis of the poetry and construction of Odyssey S. concludes that it is the uniform work of a great creative poet. Reviewer disagrees in details, but agrees with main conclusions.—P. Viereck, *Ostraka aus Brüssel und Berlin* [Berlin, 1922, de Gruyter. Pp. 177] (Bilabel). Ninety-nine texts edited with V.'s usual carefulness.—E. Bethe, *Homer, Dichtung und Sage. II. Band: Odyssee, Kyklos, Zeitbestimmung nebst den Resten des Troischen Kyklos und einem Beitrage von F. Studniczka* [Leipzig, 1922, Teubner. Pp. xv+392] (Dahms). Reviewer largely disagrees, but emphasises the value of B.'s work in Homeric research; the middle section on the Epic Cycle is of special importance and very learned.—T. Zielinski, *Tragodumena. Untersuchungen über die Entwickelung tragischer Motive. Heft I.: Danae und Iphigenie in der tragischen Mythopoeie* [Petrograd, 1919. Pp. 56] (Sonny). Written (in Russian) with fine poetic understanding and complete mastery of material; a landmark in the study of ancient tragic art. Reviewer summarises at some length.

LATIN LITERATURE.—*M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc.* 42. *Academicorum reliquiae cum Lucullo.* Recognovit O. Plasberg [Leipzig, 1922, Teubner. Pp. xxviii+126] (Philippson). Similar to P.'s small critical edition of the *De Natura Deorum;* time and method of composition, relationship and value of MSS. established in introduction; readable text, emendations show thorough knowledge of Cicero's language; full indices.—*Octavia praetexta cum elementis commentarii.* Edidit C. Hosius [Bonn, 1922, Marcus u. Weber. Pp. 72]

(Rossbach). One of Lietzmann's series of 'Kleine Texte,' and similar to H.'s edition of Vergil's *Eclogues;* very careful collection of explanatory references, models, and imitations, mostly printed in full under the text. Reviewer adds many variant readings.

HISTORY.—J. Hasebroek, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus* [Heidelberg, 1921, Winter. Pp. viii+202] (Heer). Successfully reconstructs from the fragmentary tradition together with coins and inscriptions the outward course of events.

PHILOSOPHY.—A. Delatte, *Essai sur la politique pythagoricienne* [Liège, 1922, Biblioth. de la faculté de philos. et lettres de l'univ. de Liège. Pp. xi+295] (Immisch). D.'s examination of Pythagorean writings on political theory is a noteworthy achievement in this neglected field.

LANGUAGE.—F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch, enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen, ägyptischen, hebräischen, arabischen und sonstigen semitischen und nicht-semitischen Menschennamen soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden Ägyptens sich vorfinden* [Heidelberg, 1922, Selbstverlag des Herausgebers. 526 columns] (Kiessling). Contains some 17,000 personal names, about 8,000 of which are Greek; indispensable to papyrologists, and very valuable to philologists in general.—Alice F. Bräunlich, *The Indicative Indirect Question in Latin* [Diss. Chicago, 1920. Pp. 211] (Baehrens). Diligent and judicious collection of material leading to valuable results; superficial in arrangement.—J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch, und Deutsch* [Basel, 1920, Birkhäuser. Pp. ii+319] (Reiter). Deals mainly with syntax of the verb; very valuable and most arresting; many grammatical notes on classical authors.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—E. Hofmann, *Bilder aus Carnuntum* [Wien, 1921, Pichler. Pp. 85; fourteen illustrations and two sketch-plans] (Wolff). Stimulating and on the whole reliable popular guide to site and museum remains of 'the Austrian Pompeii.'

EPIGRAPHY AND PALAEOGRAPHY.—S. Gsell, *Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie, T. I.* [Paris, 1922. Pp. 458] (Dessau). This first volume combines the Algerian inscriptions already recorded in *C.I.L.* VIII. and its Supplements with those more recently discovered; almost all have been read or re-read by G., whose accuracy has stood every test applied by reviewer. General arrangement, method of printing, and indices closely modelled on *C.I.L.*—J. Stroux, *Handschriftliche Studien zu Cicero, De Oratore. Die Rekonstruktion der Handschrift von Lodi* [Leipzig, 1921, Teubner. Pp. 182] (Philippson). Convincing throughout. Reviewer looks forward with confidence to S.'s edition of the *De Oratore.*

METRIC.—F. Novotný, *Eurhythmie der griechischen und lateinischen Prosa* [Prague, 1918/21, Abhandlungen d. böhm. Akad., III. Klasse, Nos. 47 and 50. Pp. 304] (Svoboda). Contains a number of new and stimulating ideas. Written in Czech.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

**** Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Atkins (H. G.) A History of German Versification. Ten Centuries of Metrical Evolution. Pp. xvi + 282. London: Methuen, 1923. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Bolkestein (H.) 'Fabrieken' en 'Fabrikanten' in Griekenland. (Overdruk uit Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis, afl. 1, 1923). Pp. 32. Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1923. Paper.

Boulenger (F.) Essai critique sur la syntaxe de l'empereur Julien. Remarques critiques sur le texte de l'empereur Julien. (Mémoires et Travaux des Facultés Catholiques de Lille, Fascicules XXII., XXIII.) Pp. xxii+266, x+75. Facultés Catholiques de Lille, 1922. Paper, 25 fr. and 8 fr.

Burnet (J.) Ignorance. (The Romanes Lecture, 1923.) Pp. 20. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Paper, 2s. net.

Classical Philology. Vol. XVIII., No. 2. April, 1923.

Colbert (Sister M. C.) The Syntax of the De Ciuitate Dei of St. Augustine. Pp. x+107. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. IV.) Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1923. Paper.

Crump (L. M.) The Marriage of Nausicaa, and other poems. Pp. 35. Oxford: Blackwell, 1923. Boards, 5s. net.

De Falco (V.) L'Epicureo Demetrio Lacone. (Biblioteca di Filologia Classica, Vol. II.) Pp. 111. Naples: A. Cimmaruta, 1923. Paper, 20 lire.

Deissmann (A.) Licht vom Osten: vierte völlig neubearbeitete Auflage. 83 Abb. Pp. xvii+447. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1923. Paper.

De Witt (N. W.) Virgil's Biographia Litteraria. Pp. vii + 192. Toronto: Victoria College Press (London: Milford), 1923. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

Diehl (E.) Anthologia Lyrica, edidit E.D. I. Poetae elegiaci. II. Theognis, Carmen Aureum, Phocylidea. Pp. vi+115, ii+93. Leipzig: Teubner. Paper, 1.52s. each.

Duff (J. D.) T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Liber Primus. Edited with introduction, notes, and index by J. D. D. Pp. xxvi+136. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 4s.

Eupolis (Jr.) Carneades on 'Injustice,' an amoral story with the famous lost lecture of 155 B.C. Pp. 47. Printed privately by the Invicta Press, Ashford, Kent, 1923. Paper.

Exler (F. X. J.) The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter. A Study in Greek Epistolography. Pp. 141. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1923. Paper.

Fotheringham (J. K.) Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones, latine uertit, adauxit, ad sua tempora produxit S. Eusebius Hieronymus, edidit I. K. F. Pp. xxxix+352. London: Milford, 1923. Cloth, 48s. net.

Fowler (H. N.) A History of Ancient Greek Literature. New and revised edition. Pp. x+503. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. Cloth, $3.

Fowler (H. N.) A History of Roman Literature. Pp. ix+315. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. Cloth, 14s. net.

Ghedini (G.) Lettere Cristiane dai Papiri Greci del III. e IV. Secolo. Pp. xxviii+376. Milan: presso l'amministrazione di 'Aegyptus,' 1923. Paper.

Goetz (G.) Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, Vol. I. De Glossariorum Latinorum Origine et Fatis. Pp. vii+431. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Paper, 22s.

Grose (S. W.) Fitzwilliam Museum. Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins. Vol. I.: Western Europe, Magna Graecia, Sicily. Pp. xii+380, 111 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 84s. net.

Halliday (W. R.) The Growth of the City State: Lectures on Greek and Roman History. First Series. Pp. 264. Liverpool: University Press, 1923. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Henderson (B. W.) The life and principate of the Emperor Hadrian, A.D. 76-138. Pp. xi+304. London: Methuen, 1923. Cloth, 15s. net.

Holmes (T. R.) The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire. Three vols. Pp. xvi + 486, xvi + 337, xix + 620. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 63s. net.

Hopfner (T.) Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae, Pars II. auctores ab Horatio usque ad Plutarchum continens. Pp. 125. Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1923. Paper, 4.80 Swiss francs.

Italie (G.) Euripidis Hypsipyla, cum notis criticis et exegeticis edidit G. I. Pp. xii+80. Berlin: Ebering, 1923. Paper.

Lang (Andrew). The Poetical Works of A. L., edited by Mrs. Lang in four volumes. Pp. xvi+249, xi+262, viii+227, vi+231. London: Longmans, 1923. Cloth, 42s. net.

Livingstone (R. W.) The Pageant of Greece, edited by R. W. L. Pp. xii+436. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net.

Lundström (V.) Tacitus' Poetiska Källor. Pp. 24. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri, 1923. Paper.

Mackail (J. W.) The Alliance of Latin and English Studies. Pp. 19. London: Murray, 1923. Paper, 1s. net.

Mattingly (H.) Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum. Vol. I.: Augustus to Vitellius. With an introduction and 64 plates. Pp. ccxxxi+464. London: British Museum and elsewhere, 1923.

Marouzeau (J.) L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine. I.: Les groupes nominaux. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, XII.). Pp. xvi+236. Paris: E. Champion, 1922. Paper.

Marx (F.) M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc. 1: Incerti auctoris De Ratione Dicendi ad C. Herennium lib. IV., iterum recensuit F. M. Pp. xxiv+195. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Paper, 3s.

Merrill (E. T.) Catulli Veronensis liber, recensuit E. T. M. Pp. viii+92. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. Paper, 1.28s.

Μουσεῖον, *Rivista di Antichità*. Anno I., Fascicolo II. Naples: Rondinella e Loffredo, 1923.

Murray (G.) The Choëphoroe (Libation-bearers) of Aeschylus translated into English rhyming verse. Pp. 83. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1923. Cloth, 3s. net.; paper 2s. net.

Parsons (Sister W.) A Study of the Vocabulary and Rhetoric of the Letters of Saint Augustine. Pp. vii+281. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. III.). Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1923. Paper.

Poulsen (F.) Travels and Sketches, translated from the Danish. Pp. 235. London: Chatto and Windus, 1923. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Reed (M.) Julia. A Latin Reading Book. Pp. ix + 98. London: Macmillan, 1923. Cloth, 2s. net.

Rogers (B. B.) The Ecclesiazusae of Aristophanes, translated by B. B. R. Pp. 85. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1923. Paper. 2s. net.

Rogers (H. L.) and *Harley* (T. R.) Roman Home Life and Religion: A Reader. Pp. xiii+243. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth.

Sikes (E. E.) Roman Poetry. Pp. vii+280. London: Methuen, 1923. 8s. 6d. net.

Sloman (H. N. P.) Caesar: Books I. and II. of the Civil War, partly in the original and partly in F. P. Long's translation, edited by H. N. P. S. Pp. 142. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

Stebbing (W.) Greek and Latin Anthology thought into English verse. Part I.: Greek masterpieces. Part II.: Latin masterpieces. Part. III. Greek epigrams and Sappho. Pp. xii+300, x+304, xvi+199. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1923. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net. each.

St. John (C.) The Plays of Roswitha, translated by C. St. J., with an introduction by Cardinal Gasquet and a critical preface. (Vol. XVII. of the Medieval Library.) Pp. xxxvi+160. London: Chatto and Windus, 1923. Boards, 5s. net.

Sundwall (J.) Zur Deutung kretischer Tontäfelchen II. (Acta Academiae Aboensis Humaniora IV.) Pp. 11. Åbo Akademi, Åbo, 1923. Paper.

The American Journal of Philology. Vol. XLIV. No. 2. Whole No. 174. April, May, June, 1923.